

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1860.

---

ART. I.—*Quakerism, Past and Present. The First Prize Essay.*  
By JOHN STEPHENSON ROWNTREE. London: Smith, Elder  
& Co.

2. *The Peculium: an endeavour to throw light on some of the  
Causes of the Decline of the Society of Friends.* By THOMAS  
HANCOCK. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

WE once heard a young lady ask an old F.R.S. 'Why did Newton's apple fall?' and the old gentleman, with becoming gravity, replied, 'Because it could not help it.' The answer appeared to be quite satisfactory on that occasion; and we think it might be so on the present. We do not mean to say that the cause, and nature, and extent of the decadence of Quakerism should not be most carefully investigated by persons concerned in the matter; but we take leave to suggest that the inquiry should be carried on by Friends themselves; and, if it can be managed, at silent meetings. We suggest this without any feeling of unkindness, or any intention to disparage the members of the Society of Friends, many of whom have, in various ways, established claims to our respect. All we mean—and we wish to express it as strongly and plainly as possible—is, that the question why Quakerism has declined, and how it may be revived? is hardly worth discussing; because it seems quite certain that the sect can never be restored to any one of the states or positions in which it has heretofore existed, but must go on growing more and more into a conformity with the manners and habits of general society in whatever part of Christendom its tent may be pitched.

The phenomena of decadence have long been obvious. Several years have passed since a writer of the present day remarked that 'even common observers must have noticed that, for a long time past, Quakers have been quietly getting more like other people. Broad-brims have been shrinking; while, as if in compensation, other parts of dress have crept down to the

'ankles; drab coats have darkened into something almost as dark and worldly as mourning; silk gowns have bloomed into plum-colour; and bonnets, if not actually in flower, exhibit a growing vivacity of form and colour which promises a sprightly development of some sort: children are in a transition state which excites compassion.'

Things have not, however, advanced so rapidly as was expected when these words were written. They referred to some articles in *The Friend*, which is, or was, a monthly publication, describing itself as a religious and literary journal for the Society of Friends. The very first article of correspondence in the number for 1st month, 1853, is headed, in large capitals, with three notes of admiration. 'Quaker Brothers in Mourning for the Duke of Wellington!!!' That such a thing should be at all, and still more that it should be thus told in Gath, were novelties; and it seemed hard to say whether the juvenile depravity in crape, or the frank publication of it by 'Senex,' was the more portentous. His letter, however, respecting these young offenders gave rise to a good deal of discussion in succeeding numbers of the *Friend*, in which it was seriously and freely debated whether 'the peculiarities' were not, after all, things which it would be rather better to be rid of. One writer went so far as to say, 'These distinctions have the effect of needlessly separating us from other Christian believers, operate as a burlesque on religion itself, and prejudice the irreligious against it;' while another more clearly indicates where the shoe pinches by saying, 'It must be evident to the most common observer that our young men are increasingly disposed to lay aside the peculiarity of dress.' This, no doubt, is true, and only what might be expected. Hats and coats, bonnets and caps, of a quaint demonstrative cut, are letters-patent addressed to the world at large; and they form a public testimony which, some for one reason, and some for another, are not anxious at all times and in all places to force on the notice of those who may be inclined to make fun of them. Dress, however, though it has always been a difficult matter to deal with, and one that has, no doubt, greatly contributed to the decadence of the sect, is, after all, a secondary matter, and we must not exaggerate its influence. There are other causes equally obvious and more powerful. It may suffice, for the present, to mention one.

George Fox tells us in his 'Journal' that 'there was one Hewes, of Plymouth, a priest of great note in Oliver's days, who, when some liberty was granted, prayed "That God would put it into the hearts of the chief magistrates of the nation to remove this cursed toleration;" and others of



'them prayed against it by the name of "Intolerable Toleration."<sup>1</sup> There is a sense in which the founder of Quakerism, if he had been a far-sighted man, might have adopted this language; for to sectarianism, toleration is of all things 'most tolerable and not to be endured.' But if Fox did not foresee the fortune of his followers, his friend, George Whitehead, long afterwards, looked back and confessed that 'The persecution 'time was a seed time for the truth and Gospel of Jesus Christ; and that while it lasted, 'the faithful grew and multiplied.'<sup>2</sup> Intolerance might be oppressive to individuals; but as to the sect, '*premendo sustulit*.' There was some life in the thing when men might fairly count upon kicks and cuffs, and worse consequences, for little oddities which their neighbours, as foolish as themselves, took in dudgeon. This 'Thou and Thee,' says George Fox, 'was a sore cut to proud flesh;' and it was something to be able to add, 'so that we were often beaten and 'abused, and sometimes in danger of our lives, for using those 'words to some proud men.'<sup>3</sup> This was much; and it was more still to launch those 'peculiarities' from beneath a beaver which racks and tortures, and Archimedes himself, might have tried in vain to move. But to have such 'testimonies' kindly overlooked, and politely unnoticed, is poor work. The play, be it tragedy or comedy, is not worth keeping up when the spectators no longer heed the performance, and the actors are more than half ashamed of it.

In fact, as it regards some of its essentials and fundamentals, Quakerism is already extinct. It has little or nothing to say on what were once its great points,—so great, and so earnestly pressed, as to extort respect for men, and even women, who were unwise and misguided. Quakers are no longer wild, perhaps naked, fanatics rushing through the streets, and into steeple-houses, to proclaim judgments on the land, the overthrow of all churches and governments, and the end of the world. No longer are they enthusiastic missionaries forcing their way to Pope and Turk, Jew and Infidel; and found up and down the wide world in such odd places and predicaments as to be mistaken (if it always was a mistake) for spies and political agents. No voice like William Penn's now breaks the silence of their meetings with triumphant assurance that God will 'daily bring forth, by his eternal arm, many noble 'champions for his glory, who shall sound forth his wonders to 'the ends of the earth, and stand as Saviours (upon Mount 'Zion) to the nations. And, therefore, woes to the dark, 'hellish, sin-pleasing, persecuting priests, professors, and pro-

<sup>1</sup> P. 240.<sup>2</sup> Christian Progress, p. 631.<sup>3</sup> Jour. p. 245.

'phane of the whole earth; for the Lord God Omnipotent is taking to Himself his great power, and He will reign whose kingdom stands in righteousness, and is an everlasting kingdom, and of whose government and dominion there shall be no end.'<sup>1</sup>

And while their higher and greater thoughts have perished—while the weightier matters of their law have been suffered to pass out of mind—their social oddities, consisting chiefly of quaint dress, bad grammar, and little rudenesses in speech and behaviour, which would be unpleasant from sensible men if we did not know that it was only their way, have arrived at the dignity of being called 'THE PECULIARITIES'—as if (to say nothing of things still stranger, and less pardonable) it was not a more notable peculiarity in Mary Fisher to make her own way, all by herself, to the Sultan's camp at Adrianople, and have a long talk with him, than it would have been to stay at home in a starched cap, saying 'thou sees' and 'thee knows' to her neighbours.

At the same time, it must be observed, that the maintenance of the puny peculiarities which survive has been a matter of great difficulty to the sect. Friends have found the gnats harder to deal with than the camels. The complaint has always been against the young from the days of Fox to those of Thomas Story and Sarah Grubb, and from their days to our own.

It is natural that such a movement should come from the younger portion of any community; but there is in this case a peculiar and, we may say, retributive propriety not obvious to those who have not looked into the origin and early history of Quakerism. Friends tell us triumphantly—even one of those correspondents of the *Friend* does so—of 'a Fox, a Penn, and a Barclay.' Whenever old times are talked of, these, and other ancients of the heroic age of Quakerism, bear down upon us under an impenetrable *testudo* of broad beavers, all and each, we are to suppose, covering the silver locks of age and experience guided by 'best wisdom.' Like Shrewsbury, which, in its Mayor's estimation, had always been an ancient town, they are only thought of as veterans. Their names call up the idea of demure elders; and one cannot imagine that they ever were young. It is, however, certain, and the fact is very well worth notice, that whatever may be the merits or the demerits of the sect, either as it was or as it is, it was originally founded, and was kept up during its heroic age, by men who had not arrived, if they ever did arrive, at years of discretion.

---

<sup>1</sup> Testim. to Cole, in Cole's Works, p. 19.

Our attention was accidentally called to this fact by the review of Tuke's 'Memoirs of George Whitehead' in the *Friend's Magazine*,<sup>1</sup> 1830; in which the reviewer says, 'We are forcibly struck with a few particulars. GEORGE WHITEHEAD was a very useful member of the Society at an early period of his life: in the year 1661, when only twenty-four years of age, he pleaded the cause of his friends at the bar of the House of Commons.' No doubt he did; we have his own account of it in his autobiography, which was published under the title of 'The Christian Progress of that *Ancient* Servant and Minister of Christ, George Whitehead.' We mark the word 'ancient,' though it was used with great propriety after the subject of the memoir had been for some years a subject of King George; but with regard to this early exploit he tells us, 'As we were upon withdrawing out of the House, some of the members near the door gently pulled me by my coat-sleeve; I turned and asked them, "What they would have with me?" They said, "Nothing, but to look upon you:" I being but a young man, about twenty-four years of age.' He had, however, been imprisoned for preaching when 'so young as but about eighteen years old;' and for the purpose of our inquiry we must go still farther back. He says, 'Being partly educated under a Presbyterian ministry, which the Lord shewed me in divers things came short of what they professed and pretended in their worships, preachings, and prayings; insomuch that (before I heard of the people called Quakers) I could not cordially joyn with them; and being at a loss in my spirit, for what I sometimes secretly desired and wanted, I was as one bewildered, and wandered farther, seeking among other people who had some higher and more refined notions concerning spiritual gifts, &c. I was then about *fourteen* years of age. After a short time I heard of some people called Quakers, &c.

Poor lad, surely he was startled when, after his long and anxious search, 'Quod Petis' announced himself in so quaint a form; but the reader will see, by the few specimens that fall in our way, that this was a time when there were always multitudes of men, women, and even children, who had been driven to and fro, and tossed up and down, until, according to their several temperaments and circumstances, they were ready to entertain any novelty that promised to relieve their mental exhaustion, by either repose or excitement.

The reviewer very justly adds—'In respect to his youthful

<sup>1</sup> Eighth month, 1830, p. 600.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Chr. Pr. p. 270.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1.

'services he was on a footing with many of his contemporaries and fellow-ministers of the Gospel; . . . conspicuous services were performed by many of our honourable predecessors almost before they had arrived at mature age.' He then proceeds to mention several instances which are well worth attention, and which we shall take the liberty to confirm by a few bracketed interpolations as we quote them:—

'JAMES PARNALL' [of whom the first sentence in the preface to Callaway's memoir of him, published in 1846, tells us that 'at the early age of sixteen' he 'was made an able minister of the Gospel,'] 'died a martyr in Colchester Castle at the age of twenty.' [A. D. 1656.]

'WILLIAM PENN wrote his "No Cross no Crown" when confined in the Tower of London, at the age of twenty-four;' [and says, moreover, in the account of his visit to the celebrated 'Ancient Maid,' Anna Maria Schurman, and her friends, 'I began to let them know how, and when the Lord first appeared unto me, which was about the twelfth year of my age, anno 1656. How at times, betwixt that and the fifteenth, the Lord visited me, and the divine impressions He gave me of Himself: of my persecution at Oxford, and how the Lord sustained me in the midst of that hellish darkness and debauchery: of my being banish'd the college; the bitter usage I underwent when I returned to my father; whipping, beating, and turning out of doors, in 1662,'<sup>1</sup> when he was about eighteen years of age.]

'ROBERT BARCLAY' ['having,' according to Sewel, 'attained the age of nineteen years, and being come to a good maturity of understanding,'<sup>2</sup> embraced Quakerism, and] 'had composed his able Apology before he was twenty-eight; and

'JOHN AUDLAND' ['a young man,' says Sewel, 'of a comely countenance, and very lovely qualities. When he was but seventeen or eighteen years old he was very religious, and a zealous searcher of the Holy Scriptures; and having a good understanding, and strong memory, he thereby gathered a large treasure of Scripture learning, became an eminent teacher amongst the Independents, and had a very numerous auditory.' He went, however, to hear George Fox in 1652, and was 'quite brought over by his effectual preaching,' and it was 'not long' before he became one of the 'publishers of that doctrine' which he had thus embraced.<sup>3</sup> His precise age does not appear; but no doubt the reviewer is quite right in saying that he] 'and

<sup>1</sup> Life prefixed to his Works, vol. i. p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> History of the Quakers, p. 472.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 54.

'EDWARD BURROUGH travelled much as ministers when very young, and the latter died a prisoner before he had completed his twenty-ninth year.' ['By his parents,' says Sewel, 'he was trained up in the episcopal worship; yet when but twelve years of age, he often went to the meeting of the Presbyterians, because their doctrine in many things seemed to him to approach nearer to truth than that of the publick Church; wherefore he became a follower of the Presbyterians.'] After a time he heard George Fox in Westmoreland, and 'about the nineteenth year of his age he first came to London with a publick testimony.'<sup>1</sup>]

These, as we have stated, are merely the names which the reviewer mentions in proof of his position, that his 'honorable predecessors' had performed 'conspicuous services' for Quakerism, 'almost before they had arrived at mature age.' He might have added others, probably several, beside two or three which we will briefly mention.

First, there was Edward Burrough's convert, THOMAS ELWOOD, who tells us in his amusing Memoirs, 'Few boys in the school wore out more birch than I. For though I was never, that I remember, whipped upon the score of not having my lesson ready, or of not saying it well, yet being a little busy boy, full of spirit, of a working head and active hand, I could not easily conform myself to the grave and sober rules, and, as I then thought, severe orders of the school, but was often playing one waggish prank or other among my schoolfellows, which subjected me to correction, so that I have come under the discipline of the rod twice in a forenoon, which yet brake no bones.'<sup>2</sup> How old was he when he was 'reached'<sup>3</sup> by Edward Burrough, whom, by the way, he describes as a 'brisk young man of a ready tongue'?<sup>4</sup> It may be doubted whether Thomas Elwood was out of legal infancy when he published his 'Alarm to Priests,' and underwent cruel buffetings for denying 'hat honour' to his father.

On the authority of Sewel we may mention 'JOSHUA COALE, who likewise in his young years came over to the Quakers.'<sup>5</sup> He is far too important a person to be passed over. William Penn has testified of him that he 'was dreadful in his testimony against the life, glory, and customes of the worlde. . . . His declaration was to the ungodly world like an ax, an hammer, or a sword, sharp and piercing, being mostly attended with an eminent appearance of the dreadful Power of the Lord, to the cutting down of many a tall cedar, to the making of many

<sup>1</sup> History of the Quakers, p. 55.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 18.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Sewel, 376.

<sup>3</sup> P. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Hist. p. 474.

'lofty oaks to bow . . . but above all, terrible was he to  
'the sowers of strife, secret backbiters, and such as rend the  
'holy body, and separate from the life, love, and fellowship of  
'the blessed truth; who in their own selfish spirit set them-  
'selves over the holy brethren, by feignedness and deceitful  
'appearances, to the betraying of the simple-hearted, and  
'ketching the innocent in their snares.'<sup>1</sup> Alas! that there  
should so soon have been need, in the infant Society of Friends,  
for any one to do such work as Friend Coale did so terribly.

Among the Testimonials prefixed to the volume referred to,  
there is one in verse. It consists of twenty-two couplets, and  
as it immediately follows the Testimonial of George Fox, and  
is signed M. F., it may be presumed that it was the contribution  
of his wife Margaret. This, one of the earliest if not best of  
Quaker poetesses, testifies:—

'His travels they were sore, within, and eke without:  
His recompense was large; yes, there's no doubt.  
Now he shines as a star, of no small magnitude,  
Who, by the power of God, hath convinc'd a multitude.'

\* \* \* \* \*

'He sweetly comforted the meek;  
Ah, he was strength unto the weak;  
But terrible he was to the stout-hearted,  
Who verily was smote before they parted.'

The poetry may be nothing to speak of, but it was probably  
the best that the poetess had to offer, and 'who would not sing  
for Lycidas?' Josiah had been, perhaps, the first Quaker poet,  
as well as the first who received a testimonial in verse. A few  
of his 'Lines,' which were 'written in Bridewel, near Laneston  
'in Cornwall, the 11th moneth, 1664, and sent to all sectaries  
'(in Christendom who had been killing and destroying one  
'another about faith and worship), but especially to the Church  
'of Rome,'<sup>2</sup> may be quoted, not merely as a specimen of his  
poetic powers, but as illustrating the idea which early Quakerism  
had of its mission. It had not any Peace Society so compre-  
hensive as to include 'peace with Rome;' and it has been  
accused of something like going down to Egypt for help, and  
confederating with Turks against Papists. It is to be hoped  
that the story may not be true about 'John Filly [or Philly], a  
'Kentish man, who, moved with zeal against Popery, came over  
'to invite the Grand Seignior to invade Hungary, to extirpate  
'it in the emperor's dominions;' but there are odd stories about  
his goings on elsewhere, which make us a little suspicious.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Testimonial prefixed to 'The Books and divers Epistles' of Coale, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Works, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> See Besse's *Sufferings*, vol. ii. p. 420.



Josiah Coale, however, having declared that the day of vengeance against Babylon had arrived, went on,—

'The holy prophets in their day foretold these things of thee,  
Which, to our consolation, we hope to live and see;  
For Jeremiah he foresaw thy desolation great,  
And said an army great should come that should give the defeat;  
Out of the north the prophet said, they should come against thee  
(Even as it is now come to pass), before whom thou must flee.'

The fact that Quakerism, after being born and bred in the north of England, had come southwards, was not unfrequently represented by members of the sect as a fulfilment of Jeremiah i. 9, 'I will raise and cause to come up against Babylon an assembly of great nations from the north country,' &c. A little farther on the poet says,—

'For th' day is dawn'd which John foresaw (and prophesied of thee),  
In which he said, and testify'd, thy total fall should be.'

And after describing the conduct by which the Romish Church had shown itself to be the subject of the prediction, he adds,—

'And truly thy divisions great, predicts thy sudden fall,  
The more, because thou hast refus'd to hear the heavenly call;  
For in thy streets the voice hath cry'd, Repent and fear the Lord,  
And turn from your idolatries, serve God with one accord;  
But like the adder thou hast been, that's deaf, and will not hear  
The charmer, who hath charmed long, so thou hast stop't thine ear.'

POOR JOHN PERROT, it is to be feared that Josiah Cole did not mean to include him among the charmers whose voices had been lifted up in the streets of the mystic Babylon, though 'John the Quaker, who went to Rome to convert the Pope,' is certainly the best known of them all; that is, so far as concerns the fact that he did go to Rome, and that the Pope put him in a madhouse. But probably few readers have suspected him of being hinted at as a 'sower of strife,' who, as we have just read in Penn's Testimonial, was addicted to 'ketching the innocent.' But so it was. Sewel tells us, that after his return from Rome he 'had so far complied with his vain imaginations, that he 'thought himself further enlightened than G. Fox and his 'friends,' and made a party of his own. Fox was so shocked, that, as he tells us, he 'was moved to give forth a paper, declaring how the Lord would blast them all, both him and 'his followers (if they did not repent and return), and that 'they should wither, like the grass on the house-top: and 'so many of them did; but others of them returned and 'repented.'<sup>2</sup> John Perrot did neither the one nor the other; but being come into America, he fell into manifest sensualities

<sup>1</sup> Hist. p. 290.

<sup>2</sup> Journal, p. 241.

and works of the flesh: 'For he not only wore gawdy apparel, but also a sword, and being got into some place in the government, he became a severe exactor of oaths, whereas before he had profest that for conscience' sake he could not swear.' It is due to John Perrot to say that we have never heard of any other 'sensualities;' and that it was not for 'sensualities' of any kind that he came under the excommunication of George Fox, but simply because he and his company, 'giving heed to a spirit of delusion, sought to introduce and set up among friends that evil and uncomely practice of keeping on the hat in time of publick prayers.'<sup>2</sup> There was a fearful strife about that; but our business at present is with the earlier days of John Perrot, and, repressing a wish to speak more fully even of them, we must make him the means of bringing us back to our point, by quoting his testimony as to the 'tenderness' of his youth when he entered on his labours.

In an 'Epistle,' which he wrote 'in Egripo, in the island of Negroponte,' addressed 'to the Greeks, especially to those in and about Corinth and Athens,' he seems to acknowledge that some apology for his youth was not only due, but had been required by the grave and reverend seniors whom he was addressing, and whose religious services in their 'house of Rimmon,' he had been moved to attend 'on the 27 day of the 7 month in the year accounted 1657, being the first day of the week, the day of Greeks solemn worship.'<sup>3</sup> 'Carlo Dessio, Gumeno Stephaci,' he exclaims, 'called Greek doctors of your people in the city of Athens, among whom I was conversant in the power of the Spirit of the Lord, and preached unto you the Everlasting Gospel, in crosse to your wisdomes, wherefore ye resisted my testimony, and called me fool, and said, all young men are fooles.'<sup>4</sup> At the same time, John did not condescend to any apology beyond mere explanation. 'Ye know not,' said he, 'the right hand from the left, and therefore I write little things unto you, and do speak plain words concerning you . . . and therefore I further say, That it is not a shame unto you, whose long hairs declare seniority without, in the antiquity of your dayes, to stoop and bow your necks, for your backs to bear the chastisement of the rod of your younger in years; and know ye that it was prudence in as many of the aged, whose faces wore a fair show of grey hairs, not to despise the youth of tender Timothy.'<sup>5</sup> And more than ten pages after, he again recurs to it, as if it had been rather a sore point: 'You doctors of Athens, remember

<sup>1</sup> Sewel, p. 290.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Fox's Journal, p. 248.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 24.

<sup>5</sup> P. 25.

' my rod . . . I have not forgotten the strength on which you took hold, which appeared and proved as a ravelled string of a broken bow, which could not carry forth so as to send home the shaft; you aimed at my birth, to have trodden upon the simplicities and tendernesses of my youth,'<sup>1</sup> &c.

We hope it will not be thought that by thus insisting on the feature of juvenility we mean to maintain the opinion of the old gentlemen of Athens, that all young men are fools. At the same time, many respectable people have an impression that those who have not had even time for observation, experience, and reflection,—especially if they are untaught but prone to teach, impatient of restraint but forward to impose it,—are not the fittest persons to be entrusted with the business of forming, or reforming, churches.

But has it not struck the reader as a strange thing, that in reckoning up this list of youthful apostles, the reviewer whom we have quoted did not mention the name of GEORGE FOX? He reckons youthful apostles of twenty-four, twenty-eight, twenty-nine years of age—why, the father and founder of Quakerism had renounced home and kindred, and begun his career of independent action, by the time that he was about nineteen. To avoid a mistake which has been made before now, and to which this inquiry is peculiarly liable, it is right to mention that young 'George Fox' and 'George Fox the Younger,' though contemporary and eminent Quakers, were two very different persons. The exact age of the latter seems uncertain; but he had been in the army, and was the older man of the two; and only 'the younger' in Quakerism.

Unfortunately, the early history of George Fox (the real Simon Pure) is very little known. We have, it is true, his 'Journal,' which relates many of his proceedings very minutely; and appears to have been, in a great measure, made from notes taken soon after the occurrences which it records. At the same time it is obvious, that it does not tell us more than Fox himself meant to tell the public; and (what makes it worse) it seems pretty certain that it does not tell us so much. We have to consider, not only that he kept the manuscript Journal by him as long as he lived, and through great changes of men and things, and that all that time he could add or cancel what he pleased; but we must also bear in mind that when it came into the hands of his friends they took considerable pains, and great liberties, to make the Journal what they thought it ought to be, before it was printed.

A good deal might be said on this point, and on the variations

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 35.

of different editions; but the discussion would be tedious. We will only suggest one thing which is not equally obvious, but which may be more or less important in estimating the authority of the work. Our observation of the matter was quite accidental; and whether the case is singular, or one of many, we do not know; but it is curious in itself, and it suggested the idea that, in the long period during which the Journal lay unpublished, some old stories may have lost their way; and some things done by others may have been, without intentional dishonesty, appropriated by, or assigned to, the Hercules of the sect. The fact is at all events worthy of notice. Under the year 1662, in Fox's Journal, we read:—'There were two of our friends in prison in the Inquisition at Malta; they were both women. The name of the one was Katharine Evans, and of the other Sarah Chevers. I was told that one, called the Lord d'Aubeny, could procure their liberty; wherefore I went to him: And having informed him concerning their imprisonment, desired him to write to the magistrates there for their release. He readily promised me he would; and said, If I would come again within a month, he would tell me of their discharge. I went again about that time; and he said he thought his letters had miscarried, because he had received no answer. But he promised he would write again; and he did so: and thereupon they were both set at liberty. With this great man I had a great deal of reasoning about religion,' &c.

This may be true. It is just possible that Fox may have interested himself in the matter as much as he states, without becoming aware that anybody else had done anything in it; but we cannot help suspecting that, intentionally or not, some injustice is done to friend Gilbert Latey, whom we have sincerely respected ever since we met with his address 'To all you Taylors and Brokers who lye in wickedness.'<sup>2</sup> It is, indeed, singular that his name is not mentioned in the business; and only once, as far as we have observed, and that quite incidentally, in any part of Fox's Journal. Yet surely Fox must have known, and had to do with him. Not on account of his grey coat and leather breeches,<sup>3</sup> nor perhaps in any way while

<sup>1</sup> Page 252. It is the more worth while to notice this, as the same account is given by Sewel, p. 293.

<sup>2</sup> See Hawkins's Brief Narrative of the Life and Death of that Ancient Servant of the Lord and his People, p. 36.

<sup>3</sup> It is a matter of mere curiosity, but we should like to know on what authority J. H. (a correspondent in *The Friend* for 6th month, 1853, p. 105) says that George Fox 'constructed himself leathern garments.' As to the phraseology, a kindred, and more absurd, specimen may be found in the modern edition of the Journal, vol. ii. p. 46, where Thomas Ibbots' original 'britches' are changed

he had 'great reputation in the world' as a tailor, 'being employ'd and respected by persons of the first rank and 'quality,' but in later times. Who did not know that 'ancient friend and brother,' as George Whitehead calls him; adding that he had been his 'true companion in laborious solicitations 'in the late three kings' reigns.' He might have said, too, in the chat with Charles Stuart when he 'was very pleasant, and 'asked the Friends several questions, as why they could not as 'well say Ay and No, as Yea and Nay,' and went on to talk about 'Thee and Thou,' and 'hat honour.' And then, after the very questionable compliment, 'I admire to see such wise men Quakers,' Gilbert having 'asked if they might speak 'freely, for that they were in great hazard in approaching the 'King's presence,' his Majesty stretched out his hand and said, 'Let no man molest or meddle with them, but let them come to 'me when they have occasion.'

Whoever reads the Memoirs of this worthy man will find, and we think believe, a story how friend Latey heard of the imprisonment of these female friends, whom Fox represents as owing their deliverance to his own interference; and how he 'got information 'that one Lord Obaney, who came over with the Queen-mother, 'and was Lord Almoner to her, had both interest, power, and 'command in the island of Malta, which when Gilbert had 'gained the knowledge of, [he] soon found a necessity upon him 'to attend the Lord Obaney, and found him to be a well-'tempered man.'<sup>1</sup>—how the Lord Obaney 'was very kind and 'free to Gilbert, and reasoned with him like Felix with Paul'—how they got to be so friendly and confidential that the Lord Obaney would needs have him into the Queen's chapel, 'where 'Gilbert, seeing the people on their knees, and the candles 'lighted on the altar, made a halt, and asked the Lord Obaney 'what he meant by bidding him come in there; "for," said he, "thou knowest I can bow to nothing;" upon which he answered, "Follow me, and nobody shall hurt you or meddle with you." Upon which Gilbert followed him through the chappel to 'a room behind the altar, where was another of the Queen's 'priests; and there being some lesser altars, the Lord Obaney 'said to Gilbert, "You never yet saw me in my priestly 'habit, but now you shall;" and whilst he was making ready, 'the Power of the Lord worked so much on Gilbert, that he 'stepped up on a place they called a private altar, and the word 'of the Lord came to him to preach truth unto them.'

---

into 'trousers'; keeping their strings at the knees. We do not know how far Mr. Armistead, who furnished the notes, is responsible for the foolish modernization of the text.

<sup>1</sup> Page 50, *et seq.*

This was certainly what might be considered as making himself at home; but it seems to have been well taken. 'Gilbert ceased not to visit the Lord Obaney,' till he learned that his friends in Malta were at liberty: 'and they some time after arrived in England, came to London, and went to visit Gilbert; and after acknowledging his love and endeavours for their liberty, desired him to bring them to the sight of the Lord Obaney.' Gilbert took them accordingly, and explained to my lord that they were the friends whom he had served, and that they 'were now come to pay their acknowledgments to him for the same; whereupon he asked if they were the women? To which they reply'd, They were; and according as the Lord put it into their hearts they spake to him;' [if we may judge of their speeches from their letters, at considerable length] 'adding, that were it in their power, they should be as ready in all love to serve him; upon which he reply'd, "Good women, for what service or kindness I have done you, all that I desire of you is, that when you pray to God, you will remember me in your prayers;" and so they parted.'

But to return to the subject of George Fox's Journal, from which we should not have suffered our really respected friend Gilbert Lathey to lead us so far, and keep us so long, but with a view to our main subject. Such as the Journal is we must take it, and make the best of it; and when we have done that we really know very little about George Fox's early history. 'As I grew up,' he says, 'my relations thought to have made me a priest, but others perswaded to the contrary.'<sup>1</sup> This is, perhaps, the only direct statement respecting what was probably a very important and influential matter. It may, possibly account (there seems to be nothing else that does) for his bitter hatred of the clergy, and for the tenor of some of the earliest revelations which he says that he received. In the meantime this project of the Church, and we presume a University education, being abandoned, he was 'put to a man, that was a shoo-maker by trade, and that dealt in wooll and used grazing, and sold cattel; and a great deal,' he says, 'went through my hands. While I was with him, he was blest; but after I left him, he broke, and came to nothing.'<sup>2</sup> At what age, or on what terms, he was put to this shoemaker we do not find; but he seems to have considered himself as pretty much his own master: for 'on the 9th day of the 7th month, 1643,' when he was about nineteen, 'at the command of God,' as he says, he left his relations, 'and brake off all familiarity or fellowship with young or old.' From that time

<sup>1</sup> Journal, p. 2.<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 2.



he seems for some years to have led a rambling, solitary life. He says, 'Now, during all this time I was never joined in profession of religion with any, but gave up myself to the Lord; having forsaken all evil company, and taken leave of father and mother, and all other relations, and travelled up and down as a stranger in the earth, which way the Lord inclined my heart.'<sup>1</sup> On the next page he tells us, 'I was afraid of all company. . . . I had not fellowship with any people, priests, or professors, nor any sort of separated people: but with Christ, who hath the key, and opened the door of light and life unto me. And I was afraid of all carnal talk and talkers; for I could see nothing but corruptions, and the life lay under the burden of corruptions.'<sup>2</sup>

At some time during this period—apparently early in the year 1646—as he was walking in a field on a first day morning, he says, 'The Lord opened to me, "that being bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to fit and qualifie men to be ministers of Christ."' He adds that he 'stranged at it because it was the common belief of the people. But I saw it clearly,' he goes on to say, 'as the Lord opened it to me, and was satisfied; and admired the goodness of the Lord, who had opened this thing unto me that morning: which struck at Priest Stevens [of Drayton, Fox's native place], his ministry, namely, that "To be bred at Oxford and Cambridge was not enough to make a man fit to be a minister of Christ." So that which opened in me, I saw, struck at the priest's ministry.' His next revelation appears to have been that 'God, who made the world, did not dwell in temples made with hands.' This, he says, 'opened in me, as I walked in the fields to my relation's house. And when I came there, they told me that Nath. Stevens, the priest, had been there, and told them, "He was afraid of me for going after new lights. And I smiled in myself, knowing what the Lord had opened in me concerning him and his brethren: But I told not my relations."<sup>4</sup>

Thus the matter of the clergy and their churches was settled; but Fox does not seem to have considered himself as having received his commission to go forth into the world, and testify against it and its clergy until some time in the year 1648. Having stated that the Lord had said to him, 'Thy name is written in the Lamb's book of life, which was before the foundation of the world,' he proceeds, 'Then some time after the Lord commanded me to go abroad into the world, which was like a briary, thorny wilderness. And when I came in

<sup>1</sup> Journal, p. 7.<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 8.<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 5.<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 6.

'the Lord's mighty power, with the word of life into the world, the world swelled, and made a noise, like the great raging waves of the sea. Priests and professors, magistrates and people were all like a sea, when I came to proclaim the day of the Lord amongst them, and to preach repentance to them.'<sup>1</sup>

It would be tedious to enumerate the heavy and multifarious burdens which this unhappy young man had, or fancied he had, all at once, bound upon him. He was 'sorely exercised in going to their courts to cry for justice, and in speaking and writing to judges and justices to do justly'—warning publicans not to 'let people have more drink than would do them good'—testifying against wakes, feasts, May-games, sports, plays, shows,—at fairs also and markets, to declare against deceitful merchandize, cheating and cozening—to cry against all sorts of music and mountebanks—he 'was much exercised too with school-masters and school-mistresses,' to prevent children from being 'nursed and trained up in lightness, vanity, and wantonness.' Likewise, he 'was made to warn masters and mistresses, fathers and mothers, in private families to take care that their children and servants might be trained up in the fear of the Lord, and that they should be therein examples and patterns of sobriety and virtue to them.' And he seems to have wound up the long list of his burdens, by telling us at the end of a paragraph, filling almost a folio page, that he was 'exercised about the star-gazers,'<sup>2</sup> &c.

'He seems,' we say—but he has only paused to take breath after this long list of duties, which we have unmercifully condensed; and he begins a fresh paragraph with a subject which seems to have lain nearer his heart than any of them. 'But,' he says—as if he were going to mention some further duty so burdensome as to present an obstacle to the performance of others—'But the black, earthly spirit of the priest wounded my life: And when I heard the bell toll, to call people together, to the steeple-house, it struck at my life:' [unhappy man, one expects him to go on with a lamentation that the Sabbath-bell was an invitation to hear, what he considered false doctrine, and heresy, from somebody whom he charitably assumed to be an ignorant and ungodly man: but no such thing. He proceeds:] 'For it was just like a market-bell, to gather people together that the priest might set forth his ware to sale. O the vast sums of money, that are gotten by the trade they make of selling the Scriptures, and by their preaching, from the highest bishop to the lowest priest. What one trade in the world else is comparable to it?'

<sup>1</sup> Journal, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 25.

But over and above, and (in every sense of the word) beside, the performance of all these duties, Fox has stated in his Journal, that some other things were enjoined him which had more the character of 'peculiarities' than any of those which have just been specified, and which have ever since, even to the present day, formed the most obvious and well-known distinctions of his sect. There is no great peculiarity in not liking to pay parsons or tax-gatherers, or anybody else, more than one can help; and most of those who have peculiar objections to such money payments, may find peculiar methods of escape without attracting much attention. But there was something more in George Fox's case; we give his words with italics and capitals, as they stand in the original edition of his Journal:—

'Moreover, when the Lord sent me forth into the world, he forbade me *To put off my Hat* to any, *High or Low*. And I was required to *Thee* and *Thou* all Men and Women, without any respect to *Rich or Poor, Great or Small*. And as I traveled up and down, I was not to bid people *Good Morrow or Good Evening*; neither might I *Bow or Scrape with my Leg* to any one: And this made the Sects and Professions to rage.'

A pleasing and pious result; on which he seems to have looked back with great satisfaction, while he exclaims:—

'Oh! the Rage that then was in the *Priests, Magistrates, Professors* and *People* of all sorts; but especially in *Priests and Professors*. For tho' *Thou* to a single person was according to their Learning, their *Accidence* and *Grammar Rules*, and according to the *Bible*: yet they could not bear to hear it: And the *Hat-Honour*, because I could not put off my *Hat* to them, it set them all into a *Rage*. . . . Oh the *Rage* and *Scorn*, the *Heat* and *Fury* that arose! Oh! the *Blows, Punchings, Beatings* and *Imprisonments* that we underwent, for *not putting off our Hats* to Men! For that soon tried all *Mens Patience* and *Sobriety*, what it was. Some had *Hats* violently pluck'd off, and thrown away; so that they quite lost them. The *bad Language* and *evil Usage* we received on this Account, is hard to be expressed; besides the *Danger* we were sometimes in of losing our *Lives* for this Matter, and that by the great *Professors of Christianity*; who thereby discovered, that they were not true *Believers*. And though it was but a small thing in the Eye of Man; yet a wonderful *confusion* it brought among all *Professors* and *Priests*.<sup>1</sup>

What a rich harvest of sin, from such a pitiful handful of seed; and how marvellous does it seem, that this wild youth should have had power and permission to bind such a yoke on thousands and tens of thousands in generations unborn? What sufferings did these trifles create, what anguish of mind and body, what stripes and imprisonments, what sacrifices of health and life? But if it was a command from God by an inspired prophet, who shall judge, who shall reply, who shall murmur?

The reflecting reader will perceive that the proposal to abandon 'the peculiarities'—even such of them as people now-a-days only laugh at—is a much more important one than at first

<sup>1</sup> Journal, p. 24.

sight it appears to be. As it regards Friends, it is not merely a question of 'hats-on,' or 'hats-off,' for decency' sake, or of bad grammar against good; but it is, 'Shall we deliberately and publicly withdraw our testimony to the divine mission of 'George Fox?' The Quaker who blinks this question is either ill-informed or unprincipled. Fox professed to be divinely inspired and commissioned; and if he is not received and acknowledged in the character of an inspired prophet, he must be set down for either a maniac or an impostor.

There is no other alternative. It is hardly necessary to cite proofs. His habitual language and mode of action preclude any doubt about his pretensions. 'The Lord said unto me'—'I was moved of the Lord to go'—'The Lord's power brake forth, and I had great openings and prophecies.' In what way is a man to assume the prophetic office among people who read the Bible, and form their ideas of a prophet from its pages, if it is not done by such language as this? or by the following:—'The Lord's everlasting power was over the world, and did reach to the hearts of people, and made both priests and professors tremble. It shook the earthly and airy spirit, in which they held their profession of religion and worship; so that it was a dreadful thing unto them, when it was told them, "The man in leathern breeches is come." At the hearing thereof the priests in many places would get out of the way; they were so struck with the dread of the eternal power of God: and fear surprized the hypocrites.'<sup>1</sup> What were people to understand by his telling them, 'I returned into Westmorland, and spake through Kendal upon a Market-day: And so dreadful was the power of God, that was upon me, that people flew, like chaff, before me into their houses. I warned them of the mighty day of the Lord, and exhorted them to hearken to the voice of God in their own hearts, who was *now* come to teach his people himself.'<sup>2</sup> With what scorn would the man who habitually used such language as this have turned from some modern attempts to explain away its obvious meaning.

Without the least wish to represent George Fox as better or worse than he really was, we must repeat, that a person who talked and acted as he did, could only be received as a prophet, a maniac, or a cheat. By the multitude he was no doubt viewed in one or other of the two latter characters; but many were prepared to admit his pretensions, and receive him as a teacher specially sent from God. This may seem strange—it would have been no wonder had it been simply that a fierce young man, in a grey coat and leathern breeches, with long curling

<sup>1</sup> Journal, p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 81.

hair, colossal form, and ultra-stentorian voice, rushing from one steeple-house to another to denounce priests and tithes, and tell the people not to go to church, or pay money, had been cheered on by a mob at his heels—it would have been no wonder if, beside this, he had been taken up and patronised by some who, while the ‘light within’ them was darkness, preferred his notion of being led by it, to being bound down by a written Revelation with a code of morals, and of religious discipline, founded on it. It was natural, too, that when such a leader got into scrapes, for which he obviously had peculiar opportunities and endowments, he should get a party about him. But all this, and more which will occur to the reader, may appear to him altogether insufficient to account for the facts. He may still reasonably ask why George Fox was originally received as he was, and why he is considered as he now is; and the times in which we live present some features which give to the inquiry an interest and importance which it may not at first appear to possess.

When the people who lived in the middle of the seventeenth century saw an uneducated youth abandoning all lawful calling, all home duties and ties of kindred, making extravagant pretensions, and doing extravagant things—when he called upon them to turn from the teachers whom they had been taught to look up to with reverence, and submit to the dreadful power of God who was *now* come to teach them himself—it was not only natural, but right, to ask, ‘What sign showest thou?’ This question no doubt was asked; and it was either answered, or anticipated, by facts very little understood in the present day, even by Quakers themselves. When the sect was well established, and times, as well as the state of men’s minds had altered, Friends thought it ‘best wisdom’ to say but little of some early passages in their history. We do not mean to charge modern Friends with denying or disputing George Fox’s claims to divine mission and supernatural power. Whoever looks at the index of the modern edition of his *Journal*, under the words ‘Miracles’ and ‘Visions,’ will find quite enough to clear those concerned in the work of republication from any charge of the kind. At the same time, though they may have fairly put in, and may fully believe, all the miracles and visions originally recorded in the *Journal*, and though we may thus be furnished with a sufficient record of ancient and modern Quaker doctrine on this point, yet we have reason to believe that there was much more which Fox himself did not record, or which the original editors of his *Journal* cancelled; but of which we may obtain some, though but scanty, information from other sources.

There is, indeed, in the *Journal* itself, one very curious and pregnant passage. Fox tells us, that—

'Coming to Mausfield-Woodhouse, there was a distracted Woman under a Doctor's Hand, with her Hair loose all about her Ears; and he was about to let her Blood, she being first bound, and many people being about her, holding her by Violence: But he could get no Blood from her. And I desired them to unbind her, and let her alone; for they could not touch the Spirit in her by which she was tormented: So they did unbind her. And I was moved to speak to her, and in the Name of the Lord to bid her Be quiet and still: And she was so. And the Lord's Power settled her Mind, and she mended; and afterwards received the Truth, and continued in it to her Death. And the Lord's name was honoured; To whom the Glory of all his Works belongs. Many great and wonderful things were wrought by the heavenly Power in those Days. For the Lord made bare his Omnipotent Arm, and manifested his Power to the Astonishment of many; by the healing Vertue whereof many have been delivered from great Infirmities, and the Devils were made subject through his Name: Of which particular Instances might be given, beyond what this unbelieving Age is able to receive or bear.'<sup>1</sup>

The 'Doctor,' in this case, certainly was not Mesmer, or one of his disciples. If it had been, we should be curious to see his report of it, as well as of some other 'particular instances' which, though judged unfit for publication in 'Fox's Journal,' were not wholly unrecorded elsewhere, and are marked by some singular phenomena. This hint may lead the reader to notice some things in the following pages which, without it, might not strike him. If it leads him to farther research, he will find himself repaid.

There is no doubt that the age in which Quakerism was born was 'able to receive and bear' a great deal which, when the 'Journal' came to be published after nearly half a century, would have excited contempt and ridicule. If the world had become more unbelieving during a long period of dominant impiety, the Quakers had become a very different people from their founders, and were surrounded by opponents considerably unlike the fierce sectarians with whom their veterans had had to contend. In fact, to understand the matter at all, we must look rather more generally at the religious state of the times; and, obscure as those times are, we shall see enough to learn that they were very much influenced by persons who could preach and practise, as well as 'receive and bear,' very strange things. Indeed, we cannot but hope that even the few extracts which we have given may have afforded the reader some proof of this, and may facilitate his comprehension and belief of some further evidence.

It was truly a wonderful state of things. After speaking of the Puritans, Lord Macaulay says, 'It is also to be noted, that 'during the civil troubles several sects had sprung into existence, 'whose eccentricities surpassed anything that had before been

<sup>1</sup> Journal, p. 27.



'seen in England.' Certainly, this is a thing to be noted; and it is one which has never been inquired into as it deserves. If it had been, his lordship could not have given such an illustration as follows in his next sentence:—'A mad tailor, named Muggleton, wandered from pothouse to pothouse tipping ale, and denouncing eternal torments against those who refused to believe, on his testimony, that the Supreme Being was only six feet high, and that the sun was just four miles from the earth.'<sup>1</sup>

We have nothing to say against his lordship's describing Muggleton as 'a mad tailor,' for such we believe the poor man was; but with regard to the assertions that he was given to tipping, that he taught any doctrine about the sun's distance, and that he denounced eternal torments on anybody for simply refusing to believe as he did on that, or any other point, we very much doubt. As to the rest, it derives some little colour, at least the historian's misstatement is in some degree accounted for, by Muggleton's occasionally adopting, in defiance, the phraseology of that burlesque representation of his doctrines in which some of his Quaker opponents indulged. He maintained that spirit never existed without matter; that God was revealed to man, and known by man, only as manifest in the flesh; and, for his own part, he acknowledged no God but Jesus Christ;—that, as man was made in the image of God, it was to be inferred that the Deity had a form like the form of man. These and other *dicta* were put together by the Quakers, who thought it argumentative, or witty, or at least, we will hope, not irreverent, to laugh at the tailor for worshipping a God who could not, they said, be supposed to be more than six feet high; and to ask how a Deity of such mean dimensions could span the heavens, and hold the waters in the hollow of his hand. We need not say that we are not defending Muggleton or his opinions; but without some such statement and explanation, the reader would not understand what follows.

Long before we saw Lord Macaulay's work, we had been most fully convinced of the fanaticism, heresy, and insanity of the poor tailor; but at the same time led to believe that he did more than any other individual to put down the rampant fanaticism which was raging in daemon forms of folly and blasphemy. This is strong language; but it is a very inadequate expression of an opinion formed many years since, after much inquiry and consideration:—'A cake of barley-bread tumbled into the host of Midian, and came unto a tent, and smote it that it fell.' It was, no doubt, an insane delusion to

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 163.

believe that the Almighty had given to him, or exercised through him, the power of giving solemn judgment on the eternal state of any of his fellow-men; but as to his actual exercise of that power, we have not been able to find that he ever passed sentence on any man for anything but what he, in his insanity, considered as the sin against the Holy Ghost, which in his view consisted, not in disbelieving, or refusing to receive, but in reviling and scoffing at what he called 'The Commission of the Spirit.' Something more of this will appear when we see him in collision with the Ranters, who were perhaps the most remarkable fanatics of that day, and whose proceedings must be noticed if we would understand the times.

But first let us borrow a few words from a better known and more respected source. Richard Baxter, in his autobiography, after describing two other sects, the *Seekers* and the *Vanists* says,—

'The third sect were the *Ranters*: these also made it their 'business, as the former, to set up the light of nature, under 'the name of Christ in men, and to dishonour and cry down 'the Church, the Scripture, the present ministry, and our 'worship and ordinances; and called men to hearken to Christ 'within them. But withal they conjoined a cursed doctrine of 'libertinism, which brought them to all abominable filthiness of 'life.'

After some illustration of this statement, he proceeds to say, that 'The horrid villanies of this sect did not only speedily 'extinguish it, but also did as much as anything did to disagree 'all sectaries, and to restore the credit of the ministry and the 'sober unanimous Christians: so that the devils and the Jesuits 'quickly found that this way served not their turn, and there- 'fore they suddenly took another. And that was the fourth 'sect, the Quakers; who were but the Ranters turned from 'horrid profaneness and blasphemy to a life of extreme austerity 'on the other side.'

Baxter, however, professed to have had no personal knowledge of the Ranters; and says in a marginal note, 'They were 'so very few and of short continuance that I never saw one of 'them.' He spoke truly, according to his knowledge; but the Ranters were, no doubt, more numerous and long-lived than he supposed. People do not always know all their neighbours. It might perhaps surprise some of the London clergy of the present day to learn that it is possible, indeed not very improbable, that they may have Muggletonian parishioners; and

<sup>1</sup> Lib. i. § 122, p. 76.

that they may buy Muggletonian books, printed or reprinted in London within these twenty years—perhaps much more recently, though we do not recollect having seen any. Muggleton knew much more about the Ranters than Baxter did, and he says in his quaint autobiography,—

‘After this it came to pass, in the year 1650. I heard of several Prophets and Prophetess that were about the streets, and declared the Day of the Lord, and many other wonderful Things as from the Lord. Also, at the same time, I heard of two other Men, that were counted greater than Prophets; to wit, John Tannye, and John Robins. John Tannye, he declared himself to be the Lord’s High Priest, and that he was to act over the Law of Moses again; therefore he circumcised himself according to Law. Also he declared that he was to gather the Jews out of all Nations, and lead them to Mount Olives, to Jerusalem; and that he was King of Seven Nations: With many other strange and wonderful Things. And as for John Robins, he declared himself to be God Almighty; and that he was the Judge of the Quick and of the Dead,’ &c.<sup>1</sup>

He afterwards sums up the Ranters’ character by saying,—  
‘Now John Robins was that man of sin spoken of in Thessalonians: neither will there come any so high after him, to the end of the world.’<sup>2</sup>

John Reeve, Muggleton’s cousin, was like him a tailor. His father was clerk to a deputy in Ireland, a gentleman, as ‘we call them,’ says Muggleton, ‘but fell into decay.’ ‘He was a man of no great natural wit or wisdom; no subtilty or policy was in him, nor no great store of religion he had, but what was traditional, only of an innocent life.’<sup>3</sup> How John Reeve fell in with John Robins we have not learned; but he seems to have been altogether astonished, partly proselyted, and nearly, if not quite, crazed by him: ‘for John Robins’s knowledge and language overpowered John Reeve.’ This is not very wonderful, seeing that John Robins’s doings were much out of the common way.

There is no reason for transcribing all the profane absurdities which are recorded by John Reeve; but some of them must be mentioned if we would understand what was going on at that time, and what the age would ‘receive or bear’ :—

‘This John Robins did declare, that he was to gather the Jews in all nations, and to lead them into their own land, unto Jerusalem; with many more such like things declared by him. As for his lying spiritual signs and wonders, they were these and such like: unto some that were deceived by him, he did present the form of his person riding upon the wings of the wind, like unto a flame of fire; also he did present unto some in their beds a great light like unto a flame of fire over all the room, that they have been compelled to hide their faces in their beds, fearing they should be burned; but when they hid their faces in their bed, the light did appear

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 48.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 5.

more brighter than before : also he would present unto them half-moons and stars, and sometimes thick darkness, darker than any natural darkness whatsoever : also he did present his head only in the day-time, without a body, to a gentlewoman that I know, in her chamber ; also presenting unto her, to deceive her, the forms of strange beasts as, namely, dragons and such like. Again, I declare from the Lord, that this John Robins did present the form of his face, looking me in the face in my bed the most part of a night, insomuch that I cried in my spirit unto the Lord, and the Lord, by his Spirit, revealed this great Antichrist unto me, to my exceeding joy and his everlasting praise. Much more might be spoken of his deceits in this kind ; but now I shall declare the manner of his being worshipped as a God by those deceived by him. They prayed unto him, and they fell flat on their faces and worshipped him, calling him their Lord and their God : also he gave commandment to some of them that they should not make mention of any other God, but him only : also he gave authority unto some of his disciples, both unto men and women, to change their wives and their husbands, telling them that they were not united to their own bone. This cursed Cain changed his own wife first, for an example, and called her name Eve, telling his disciples that she should bring forth his son Jesus, and it should be caught up into heaven : many of his disciples following of his cursed example, to their utter ruin in this life, and that to come. Also he commanded his disciples to abstain from meats and drinks, promising them that they should in a short time be fed with manna from heaven, until many a poor soul was almost starved under his diet, yea, and some were absolutely starved to death, whose bodies could not bear his diet : for those that believed on him indeed, they brought in their whole estates unto him, so that then he had full power over their souls, and bodies, and estates, and he did plague their spirits and bodies at his pleasure in a most dreadful manner, if they were not obedient to his commands, of the which I myself was an eye-witness. I could speak more of this prince of devils in this last age, but I know I have written enough for a spiritual Christian to discern something of this great deceiver in what I have written.—*Reeve's Transc. Spirit. Treat.* p. 4.

Such is the account of John Robins, which is given by John Reeve. Whilst he was gaining this information, his cousin Muggleton was suffering in a state of religious melancholy, which he pathetically describes in his autobiography ; the early part of which (that is, what relates to the first forty years of his life) presents a singular and interesting picture of an earnest, simple-minded hypochondriac with a strong propensity to speculate on things beyond his depth, and utterly at a loss what to believe, or do, in the Babel by which he was surrounded—worn out with controversies, and tired of receiving and rejecting doctrines, and almost driven to atheism.

'Yet,' he says, 'I considered that innocency of heart, and a just upright spirit, was good in itself, if there were no God to reward it . . . therefore I was loath to let go my integrity, but kept close to it ; for as I had been innocent from my childhood to this day, I was resolved to keep to it to the end, if there were nothing after death, yet would I keep my heart upright, and would do nothing to wound my conscience. For I never had no guilt of actual sin that did ever trouble me . . . so I was resolved to keep myself as I always had done, unspotted of the world, and not to defile my conscience : And I

had a great deal of peace of mind in this condition : And in this condition did I continue some three years, untill I was about forty years old, and in the year 1650.<sup>1</sup>

At this time, he tells us, he 'gave over all publick prayer, 'and hearing, and discourse about Religion;' and he seems to have had no disposition to become a disciple of John Robins; but, at the same time, to have been well aware of what was going on, without feeling that it was his business to interfere. He says:—

'These things had I perfect knowledge of, yet was I quiet and still, and heard what was said and done, and spake against nothing that was said or done. But shewed Kindness and Mercy to all of them, marvelling in myself what the Effect of these Things would be. And one of his Prophets came to my House very oft, and he told me all things that was done amongst them; and he had a very high Language, and very knowing in the Scriptures, and spake as an Angel of God. And my natural temper was always merciful to Strangers; and this place of Scripture run much in my Mind: Forget not to entertain Strangers, for some in entertaining of Strangers have entertained Angels. So I never let him go without Eating and Drinking. And if I had nothing in the House to Eat, if I had but Eighteen Pence I would give him One Shilling of it; and if I had but Twelve Pence, I would give him Sixpence of it. This I did many times, though I had need enough myself, for I had three Children to maintain at that time; two Daughters by my Wife Sarah, and one Son by my second Wife, Mary, then alive.'<sup>2</sup>

But so it was, this poor ex-Puritan tailor tells us, that while he was minding his business, and providing for his family in the year 1651, and in the year of his 'life 41 and better,'— 'Upon a day in the month called April, I being silent, all 'alone, my children being all abroad, there fell upon me a great 'melancholy upon my spirit, and I knew not for what, yet I was 'pressed exceedingly in my heart with fear.' He was tempted to return to the Puritans; but he recollected that he had found no peace among them, and felt that it would be 'to no purpose to turn or go back to Egypt again,'—'then,' he says, 'did 'two motions arise in me, and speak in me as two lively voices; 'as if two spirits had been speaking in me, one answering the 'other, as if they were not my own spirit.'<sup>3</sup> These motional voices held him in torment all day with disputes, which he records at considerable length, respecting election, reprobation, and eternal torments, till he was 'very melancholy, faint, and sickly,' with the day's dispute.

'Yet,' he says, 'it was a blessed day to me, as will appear hereafter, by that which followeth. After this, that very same night, the windows of heaven were opened to me, and the fountains of the water in heaven were broken up, and the water of life run down from heaven upon me . . . then was the Scriptures opened unto me so swiftly and more swiftly than my understanding could receive it; and the waters of life run down

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 24.

from the understanding of the Scriptures abundantly : And the knowledge of the Scriptures flowed in upon my understanding faster than I could receive it, and yet I thought my mind was very swift . . . these, and many more, places of Scripture was set before me, and the light of them shined clear about my understanding, and gave the interpretation of all Scripture, and all questions in spiritual things, that could arise out of the heart of man, was easy to me to answer.<sup>1</sup>

One would naturally expect to see the ecstatic tailor (especially if he was a 'drunken tailor'), under these circumstances, and with this opinion of himself and his capabilities, leap from his board and seat himself in the chair of theology. But it was quite otherwise.

'I never,' he says, 'was without motional voices opening the Scriptures all day long, when I was alone, for a long time after. So that I was so well satisfied in my mind as to my eternal happiness, so that I was resolved now to be quiet and still, and not to meddle no more with religion, but to let every one go on in their own way, for I looked at nobody's peace and happiness but my own . . . for I lov'd for to be private and still; for my nature could never endure to be publick. So I thought all was well now I had attained my desire. But when I thought to be most secure and most private, in a little time after, it made me the most publick.'<sup>2</sup>

The facts seem to have been these—that during this excitement, John Reeve was much with his cousin, Muggleton, wondering at his revelations, and imbibing his enthusiasm; and at length, as a very natural consequence, he came to imagine that he had revelations himself. In particular, what he calls a 'Commission received by Voice of Words from the Spirit of 'the Man Jesus in Glory,' on the 3d, 4th and 5th days of February, 1651-2. Some of the words which he professed (and we really think believed) that he heard on the first of these days were:—

'I have chosen thee my last messenger for a great work, unto 'this bloody unbelieving world; and I have given thee Lodowick 'Muggleton to be thy mouth . . . I have put the two-edged sword 'of my Spirit into thy mouth, that whoever I pronounce blessed 'through thy mouth, is blessed to eternity; and whoever I pronounce cursed through thy mouth, is cursed to eternity.' 'When,' he says, 'I heard these words, my spirit desired the 'Lord, that I might not be his dreadful messenger: for indeed 'I thought upon the delivering of so sad an unexpected message 'unto men, I should immediately have been torn in pieces.' But the command was (he imagined) enforced by awful threatnings. 'The next morning,' he says, 'the Lord spake unto 'me, saying, "Go thou unto Lodowick Muggleton, and with 'him go unto Thomas Turner, and he shall bring you to one 'John Tane, and do thou deliver my message when thou comest

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. pp. 32, 33.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 35.



‘there; and if Lodowick Muggleton deny to go with thee, then do thou from me pronounce him cursed to eternity.” On the third morning the command was, “Go thou to Lodowick Muggleton, and take such a woman along with thee; and then go thou unto John Robins, a prisoner in New Bridewell, and do thou deliver my message to him when thou comest there.”<sup>1</sup>

We certainly do not believe, or wish any body else to believe, that John Reeve really heard any such ‘voice of words,’ or received any such commission as he describes; but there is something in the earnest, and even eloquent, simplicity with which he speaks on the subject, which may plead for a charitable belief that he was sincere. Writing some years afterwards in reply to Isaac Pennington, he says:—

‘When the Lord made choise of such a simple poor man as I was, as many can witness in the City of London, that have known me about these twenty years, that I might instrumentally discover the two principal heads of mischievous darkness in the land; as namely John Robins past, and John Tawney almost spent, truly I had no power in me to put by his message until another time; why because (whether you can believe it or no) his voice was so glorious in me, that it shone as the sun, and it was of motion swifter than thought, and so [read, too] pleasant to be declared by tongue; yet for all that Godlike glory piercing in me, and through me, there arose a desire in me to be eased of that burden of the Lord committed to my charge, because of that sharp sentence that I was to declare against any man that should despise it; then the Lord spake again unto my soul, words of burning death, of sensible unutterable darkness, answerable to that Jonas-like rebellion in me, against so great convincing glory; and truly I was compelled immediately to cry unto him for deliverance from the wounds or anguish of my soul, that I might presently obey his word that shined in me with such light, and majesty, and glory in whatsoever it should command me.’—*Stream from the Tree of Life*, p. 78.

It may be supposed that John Reeve reported these matters, as they occurred, to his cousin; and the most remarkable part of the story is the manner in which Muggleton received the communications. He tells us:—

‘The first morning God spake to John Reeve, he came to my House, and said, Cousin Lodowick, God hath given thee unto me for ever: And the tears ran down both sides his Cheeks amain. So I asked him what was the Matter, for he looked like one that had been risen out of the Grave; he being a fresh coloured Man the Day before; and the tears ran down his Cheeks apace. So he told me the same Words as is written in his first Book, and said unto me, that God had given him a commission, and that he had given Lodowick Muggleton to be his Mouth: and said, at the same time was brought to his Mind that saying, that Aaron was given to be Moses’s mouth. But, said he, What my message is, he could not tell; but, said he, if God do not speak unto me the next Morning, I will come no more at thee. Which I was in good hopes he would not, for I was willing to be quiet.’<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tr. Sp. Tr. pp. 1, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 41.

This hope, however, was vain ; for the next morning John Reeve came to summon his cousin to go with him and attack John Tauny ; and together they went, ‘and John Reeve delivered his message to him to this effect : said he, “God hath ‘not chosen you to be the Lord’s High Priest,”’<sup>1</sup> recapitulating and formally contradicting the various pretensions which we have specified ; and Muggleton adds:—

‘These, and several other things did he speak to John Tauny ; and told him that there should never any such things come to pass, as he pretended unto ; and charged him to lay all these things down, upon the pain of eternal damnation, and gave him about a Month’s time to lay it down. But he did not, but afterwards went further on to prosecute that Design, and made Tents for every Tribe, and the Figures of every Tribe upon the Tent, that every Tribe might know their own Tent. So John Reeve seeing this, he wrote the sentence of eternal damnation upon John Tauny, for his disobedience of the Lord’s Commission, and left it at his Lodging ; for he would not be spoken with at that time. Because he had shut himself up for nine Days, and he would speak with none for that time : But he received it afterwards of the Man where he Lodged ; and after awhile he and his great Matters perished in the Sea. For he made a little Boat to carry him to Jerusalem, and going to Holland, to call the Jews there, he and one Captain James were cast away and Drowned ; so all his Power came to nothing.’<sup>2</sup>

But it remained to attack the leader of the sect ; and Muggleton gives the following account of their interview with John Robins. Having told us how he and John Reeve found Dorcas Boose (the ‘such a woman’ mentioned in the commission) he proceeds:—

‘So we three went to New Bridewell, and asked for John Robins ; and the Keeper opened the Gate, and said, “Who would you speak with ?” John Reeve said, “With John Robins.” The Keeper said, “You shall not speak with him.” Then said John Reeve to the Keeper, “Thou shalt never be at Peace.” So he shut the little gate upon us ; and as we stood a little while without the Gate, there came a Woman, a Disciple of John Robins, to come out : Saith the Keeper to the Woman, “There is two or three without would speak with your Lord, shew them the other way.” So the Keeper let the Woman out, and the Woman said unto John Reeve, “Would you speak with my Lord ?” “Yea,” saith he, “I would speak with thy Lord :” saith the Woman, “He is the same, and will be the same for ever.” “Thou saith right,” said he, “He is the same, and will be the same for ever.” Meaning the same false Christ for ever. So the Woman went and showed us the Place where John Robins was ; and she said, “Knock at that window, and my Lord will look out.” So the Woman parted from us ; then John Robins put by a Board of the Window, and looked out, and John Reeve put off his Hat, and held it under his Arm, and said, “Art thou John Robins ?” He said to John Reeve, “Put on your Hat.” He said, “I put it not off to thee, but to him that sent me.” “Stand thou still and hear the message of the Lord to thee.” He answer’d and said, “I will not, except you put on your Hat :” This he said three times. Said John Reeve the

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 44.

third time. "I put not my Hat off to thee, but to him that sent me; therefore I charge thee to stand still, and hear the Message of the Lord to thee." After the third time John Robins said, "Speak on." Then John Reeve spake, and said, "Thou may'st remember I was with thee about Six or Eight Months ago, and thou didst declare unto me, That thou wert Adam Melchisedeck that met Abraham in the Way, that received the tythes of the Spoil, and that gave Abraham bread and wine, [and after recapitulating various charges against him, which have been already specified, he added], therefore look what measure thou hast measured to others, must be measur'd again to thee. That Body of thine, which was thy Heaven, must be thy Hell; and that proud Spirit of thine, which [g. thou] said was God, must be thy Devil. The one shall be as Fire, and the other as Brimstone, burning together to all Eternity. This is the Message of the Lord unto thee." John Robins pulled his Hands off the Grates, and laid them together, and said, "It is finished; the Lord's will be done." These were all the words spake: I was both an Eye-Witness and Ear-Witness of it. After this it came to pass, that about two Months after, John Robins did write a Letter of recantation of all his great Matters, unto General Cromwell, and so obtained his liberty out of prison."<sup>1</sup>

But though we have thought it necessary to say so much of the Ranters and the self-styled Witnesses, and trust that its relevancy will be made manifest to those who read the sequel, yet it is time to show how the Witnesses and the Quakers came into collision.

As early as the year 1653 Reeve and Muggleton had been brought before the Lord Mayor; and the 'Transcendant Spiritual Treatise' of the latter formed the first head of the accusation against them—"the Lord Mayor had this book in his hand"<sup>2</sup>—how much of it he understood we pretend not to guess; but when John Reeve repeated to him the commission which he had (he said) received 'by the voice of words'—"the Lord Mayor answered John Reeve, and said, "He did believe 'it was the Devil that spake to him.'" Then to this (says 'Muggleton) I answered and said, Sir, you have sinned against the Holy Ghost, and will be damned. The Mayor clapt his hand upon his breast, and said "God forbid." Yea, said 'I, but you have.' The Lord Mayor, however, thought fit to commit the prisoners for trial under the new act against blasphemy, and forthwith sent them to Newgate. Being in due course tried and convicted, they were sentenced to be imprisoned for six months in Old Bridewell; and it was while they were undergoing this punishment (that is, between October, 1653, and April, 1654) that they fell in with the Quakers.

How this happened we do not know; for though it seems certain, from the evidence, that George Fox, Edward Burrough, and Francis Howgill were all in London during part of that time, it does not appear that they had anything to do with Old

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 68.

Bridewell. It is, however, very probable that some of their friends might have been sent there (as Isabel Buttery certainly was soon after) and that they might go to visit them. At all events, it seems that the parties did meet at that time and place; and that Reeve and Muggleton determined to deal with the Quakers as they had dealt with the Ranters, and the Ranters with them and with others, or, we might perhaps say, as the more fanatical sects were in the habit of dealing with each other.

In order to understand the matter we must look fairly at one very strange and repulsive feature of the sectarianism at that time prevalent. It may seem strange to a reader of these days, that John Reeve, whatever degree of fanaticism or craziness we assign to him, and even though (if we may trust William Penn's relation of private discourse) Muggleton acknowledged that 'he thought him hot-brained and distempered in his head,'<sup>1</sup> should have thought of being empowered to bless or curse his fellow men to eternity. But the idea was familiar to the time and among the people with whom he was conversant; and it was expressed coarsely and without mincing. In modern phraseology 'cursing and swearing' generally go together; but it will be obvious that in the case of the Quakers, as in that of some others of the period, they were quite distinct things; and men who could by no means be brought to swear, would curse fearfully. It will be apparent to those who read the sectarian writings of the period, that the antagonist sects had an idea of overcoming each other by the 'Power' in which, and with which, they spoke; and though they certainly had no right to curse one another as they did, and might be none the worse as to either their temporal or their eternal state for each other's curses, yet it is clear that the leaders had—and became leaders from having—some 'Power' by which they produced strange effects on their hearers. The exhibitions and effects of this power, though they have disappeared from the lifeless Quakerism of modern times, and infrequently and obscurely as their more early history is recorded, present some phenomena worth the attention of physiological and psychological students. This will be apparent to those who have in any degree studied the details of superstition and fanaticism relating to any period from the days of the Witch of Endor to those of Mr. John Lacy; and especially to those who have seen enough of Mesmerism and Irvingism to be satisfied of their points of identity, not only with things which have been, and with each other, but also with things that are, and seem likely to be hereafter.

It 'was Justice Bennet of Darby,' says George Fox, 'who

---

<sup>1</sup> Penn's Works, vol. ii. p. 178.

'was the first that called us Quakers, because I bid them "Tremble at the Word of the Lord," and this was in the year '1650.' This was passing over the matter very easily, and in a way which the age of *publication* could 'receive and bear.' And beside this, it was very well and sufficient to tell people that Jeremiah the prophet trembled, and his bones quaked, &c.; but Robert Barclay was more honest. He says, 'We are sensible of this Power that hath often laid hold of our Adversaries, and made them yield unto us, and joyn with us, and confess to the Truth, before they had any distinct or discursive Knowledge of our *Doctrines*; so that sometimes many at one Meeting have been thus convinced: And this Power would sometimes also reach to, and wonderfully work even in little Children, to the Admiration and Astonishment of many.'

No doubt many admired and were astonished; not only at the performances of the children—though their goings on have been among the most curious phenomena in various manifestations of fanaticism—but at the visible and sensible effects produced on those who could not in any sense be called believers or disciples.

A curious little notice of the subject may be found at the beginning of Besse's second volume of 'Sufferings.' He tells us that in the year 1652, as James Naylor (afterwards too well known in Quaker history for his 'outgoings after imaginations') was coming towards Kendal,—

'Two priests with a justice of the peace and some other magistrates, with a great multitude following them, met him, and one of the priests said to him, "Naylor, I have a message from the Lord Jesus Christ to thee, but this is not a convenient place." To which James answered, "The Lord Jesus Christ is no respecter of places." The priest then delivered what he called his message thus, "I conjure thee to tell me by what Power thou inflictest such punishment upon the bodies of creatures?" James answered, "Dost thou remember who it was that did adjure Christ to tell him if he were the Son of God, and asked by what authority he did those things?" But the priest still conjured him to tell, "By what Power he did it?" James [who seems to have been in a metaphorical sense, as he was in the literal, an old soldier] said, "Dost thou acknowledge it to be done by a Power?" "Yea," said the priest, "I have the Spirit of God, and thereby I know it is done by a Power." James said, "If thou hast the Spirit of God, as thou sayst thou hast, then thou canst tell by what Power it is done." The priest said, "When God cometh, he comes to torment the souls, and not the bodies."

The priest gained little by his inquiry, but the anecdote is rendered more valuable by the note which the historian appends. He says, 'The divine Power which attended the ministry of Naylor, and others of those early witnesses to the truth, wrought so effectually on the spirits of some of their hearers, that their bodies were affected therewith to the surprise of the

'priests, and such as were not acquainted with the nature of those operations; and which therefore this priest ignorantly called inflicting punishment.' That James Naylor had some Power which made his opponents afraid of him seems very clear. George Whitehead, in his Epistle prefixed to Naylor's works, says, that 'after the said James Naylor was brought under suffering and contempt . . . persons of a loose ranting spirit got up, and frequently disturbed our Friends Meetings in London by their ranting, singing, bawling and reproaching us, crying out against divers of our faithful ministers and their testimonies in this manner, viz. "You have lost the Power; you have lost the Power,"' &c.<sup>1</sup>

The question, indeed, between those who engaged in controversy, as it was then conducted, was, whose Power should predominate, whose curse should 'be over' the other. The point in dispute between John Reeve and the Ranters was, whose curse was most potent? After the sentence pronounced on John Robins, his followers, says Muggleton, 'consulted among themselves why they might not damn us, as we did them.' And he proceeds to relate how one Proudlove consulted with 'three of the most desperatest, atheistical Ranters that had ever been' in their company. 'They asked him what they must do. He said, "You must curse them [Reeve and Muggleton] and their God, and perhaps you may bring down their Power."' It was a matter of challenge, and a trial of strength. 'Now we sent,' says George Fox, 'to the Ranters to come forth and try their God: and there came abundance of them, who were very rude and sung, and whistled and danced: but the Lord's Power so confounded them that many of them came to be convinced.'

Such being the state of things at this period, it is not to be wondered at that the newly-arrived Quakers should have fallen in with the Witnesses, and that a quarrel should have ensued;

<sup>1</sup> Those who are acquainted with the history of Irvingism will not read the foregoing extracts without being reminded of it. Mr. Baxter, in his 'Narrative of Facts characterizing the supernatural Manifestations in Members of Mr. Irving's Congregation,' &c. says, 'I was commanded to go back to the church, where my mouth was opened, and, on the fortieth day, Power should be given, the sick should be healed, the deaf should hear, the dead should be restored, and all the mighty signs and wonders should appear: apostles and ministers should be ordained, endowed, and sent forth to the ends of the earth, to warn the world of the rapture of the saints, and make ready a people prepared for the Lord.'—2d Edit. p. 66. In his introduction, p. xxxi., he says that Mr. Irving had found one reason of his 'fall' in his having returned home, adding, 'if thou hadst heeded the counsel of him that sent thee (alluding here to the prophecy, p. 66, by which the writer was commanded to go to London, and receive the Power), and staid there where thy mouth was opened, until the Power was given, it would have been well with thee at this day instead of being very evil.'

<sup>2</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 56.



but that this actually happened we only know from an incidental statement made many years afterwards. The quarrel does not seem to have been carried on in any public manner. The Witnesses did not, as far as we know, use the pulpit at all; and it will be easily imagined that with their small means, and the impediments of the licensing system, the press was not of much use to them. Muggleton had lost his 'hot-brained' cousin; and, though he jealously resented any attempt to share his office and authority, it may be doubted whether he was ardent in the work of proselyting. When Lawrence Claxton presumed to usurp the place of John Reeve, the surviving prophet put him down with a high hand. Muggleton had always acknowledged the primacy of his cousin; though a solitary survivorship of forty years, during which he was more prominently brought before the public by Judge Jeffries, and the pillory, has made him the best known of the two. He fairly told the aspiring Claxton, 'Notwithstanding you have made yourself equal with 'John Reeve, you shall know that John Reeve was as Elijah, and that I am in the place of Elisha, and that you are in the 'place of Gehazi. This is my resolution.'<sup>1</sup> But as to proselyting, in answer to a joint letter from two eminent Quakers, Samuel Hooton and William Smith (beginning 'Friend, for so we can call thee, as Christ did Judas, and describing him as 'the man that wanders up and down to make sects,') he says, 'As for my wandering up and down to make sects, it is those 'of the Quakers that wander up and down. As those that went 'to New England, and John Parrot unto Rome, to get the 'Pope and his bishops to be disciples of Christ' . . . never was 'there any prophet, or apostle, or messenger of Christ, but 'they have travelled up and down more than ever I did, almost 'these eleven years, so that I have not travelled up and down 'as the Quakers have for to get either wise or fools to believe 'me.'<sup>2</sup> And in the same work, replying to Richard Farnesworth's charge of reviling, he says, 'Neither do I curse any, 'until he judge me first, much less revile any.'<sup>3</sup> . . . I never bless 'none but those that truly believe it [his Power], neither do I 'curse any but those that despise or persecute me, upon that 'Account; but all that doth neither receive it nor despise it, 'I let them alone, and meddle not with them, but leave them 'to stand or fall as the two seeds within them shall uphold 'them or let them fall. And as for your saying that I have 'reviled, cursed, and damned the beloved people of God, meaning you Quakers: To that I say, I never did curse any of them 'till such time as they did judge or despise my commission first,

<sup>1</sup> Spiritual Epistles, p. 31.<sup>2</sup> Neck of the Quakers Broken, p. 17.<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 18.<sup>4</sup> Ibid. n. 66.

'for I never do judge first.<sup>1</sup> . . . By the authority of the commission I received from Christ, I am made chief judge in spiritual matters, in all those that doth either receive my doctrine or despise it: But as for others that doth neither receive it nor despise it, nor hear of it, I judge them not, but leave them as God shall find them at the last day.'<sup>2</sup>

These statements are confirmed by some others which he makes respecting the neglect and indifference with which his 'commission' and revelations had been treated, in times when almost any new and extravagant doctrine would have been sure to draw followers, if urged with zeal and perseverance. In the first ten years he tells us, his commission was not owned by much above forty persons;<sup>3</sup> and when he was between seventy and eighty years of age, he declared that during thirty-three years that he had been a prophet, not one of his neighbours, acquaintance, or kindred, save only his own children, had believed his report.<sup>4</sup> Fierce as he was when provoked to pronounce those 'sad sentences,' as he called them, we may yet believe him when he says, 'I durst not preach without a commission from God without me, and not by the light of Christ within me, though I had the light of Christ within me more than any Quaker in the world hath at this day, before I had a commission from God without me; and if God without me had not forced me to take this commission upon me, I had remained quiet and still, and had let Quakers and all other opinions in religion alone; for I was of Jonas his mind, willing to sit still and be quiet, for I minded nobody's happiness but my own.'<sup>5</sup> And afterwards, in his reply to Isaac Pennington, 'If you had not written to me, against me and my revelation, I should have let you alone: for I never did judge any man or woman, till they did judge me first in one kind or other; either they judged me to be a blasphemer, a liar, deceiver, false prophet, deceit, deluder, or delusion; with other words of judging, before ever I give my judgment upon them.'<sup>6</sup> And melancholy as it is to read such language, one cannot but believe that he was in earnest when he wrote to George Fox, 'If God will not own what I have said unto you despising Quakers, or if I judge thus without a commission and authority from the true God, let God judge me with the same judgment I have judged you and others with:<sup>7</sup> this is as much as can be said by man.'<sup>8</sup> Language as strong is used in his reply to Pennington.

<sup>1</sup> Neck of the Quakers Broken, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Looking Glass for George Fox, p. 46.

<sup>3</sup> Looking Glass for George Fox, p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 58.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 77.

<sup>6</sup> Sp. Epist. p. 575.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. p. 35.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. p. 31.

But, as we have said, ten years or so passed after the meeting in Old Bridewell without public controversy; and we need not say that many and great changes took place in all matters civil and ecclesiastical between 1653 and 1663. At length, provoked by such letters as those of which a little specimen has been given, Muggleton in the latter year published his 'Neck of the Quakers Broken.' It was a reply to 'Letters of Edward Bourne, Samuel Hooton, William Smith,' &c., and it drew an answer from the great leader of the sect. Muggleton rejoined in the year 1668 by a work intituled, 'A Looking Glass for George Fox the Quaker, and other Quakers wherein they may see themselves to be right Devils,' and he began without ceremony:—

'George Fox, I saw a pamphlet of yours, entitled, "Something in answer to Lodowick Muggleton's Book, which he calls, The Quaker's Neck Broken."

'You said well, in that you said, "Something in answer to that book of the Quaker's Neck Broken," for it is a very little Something indeed; it is so little a Something, that wise men will hardly discern any Thing in it as a direct Answer: But how comes it to pass that you make no mention of your own damnation in your Answer; you know John Reeve and myself gave you the sentence of damnation a matter of fourteen years ago, when we were prisoners in Old Bridewell; there was you, Edward Burroughs, and Francis Howgel, you three were counted the chief speakers of the Quakers at that time, and you three were the first speakers of the Quakers that were damn'd by us, the Witnesses of the Spirit; but since that there have fallen a many more of your brethren under this sentence.'

Having given a list of fourteen, he adds, 'These were generally all, or most of them, speakers of the Quakers, and exercised the ministerial preaching without a commission from God,' p. 7. Our business, however, is with the sixteenth chapter, which is headed, 'How the Sentence and Curse have subdued those Witchcraft fits in the Quakers.' It begins:—

'I do know and affirm, that those speakers of the Quakers, and others whom I have passed the Sentence of eternal Damnation upon, that they have not, nor do grow in any Experience nor Revelation, since the Sentence of Damnation was passed on them, as Experience doth plainly manifest, and many will Witness unto it. And as for Fox himself, what Experience and new Revelation of Scripture have you had since you were damned a Matter of fourteen Years ago? Have you published any other Things but what you did at the first? No, not so much as you did at the first; for then it was your principle of Zeal to fall into Witchcraft-fits, supposing it was the Spirit of Christ that moved you to foam at the Mouth, and sigh and groan, and swell with Spiritual Witchcraft, and howl and groan as if Hell were like to burst in you; and perhaps a while after your Spirit would break forth into a many non-sensical Words, as if the Devil had broke forth out of Hell. Was not this your Practice? And were not these the most eminent Quakers counted amongst you, who had those Witchcraft-fits? For

the Quakers Revelation doth arise in them only when the Witchcraft-fit is upon them; nay, I have known some that have followed the Quakers, desiring to be of them, and earnestly desiring in their Meetings to have those Fits as other Quakers had; for they thought such Persons who had those Witchcraft-fits, to be much in the Favour of God, and that those Fits had been wrought by the Spirit of Christ, and that he had revealed great things unto them; and because the Parties aforesaid could not produce those Fits in themselves, as they saw others have, notwithstanding their melancholy life, their framing their outward Apparel, and observing every Motion in the Mind, according to the Quakers Doctrine, they left no Stone unturned, nor no Endeavour neglected, in the Quakers Way, that they might attain those Witchcraft-fits, but could not attain them, do what they could: They got the Quakers Language of Thee and Thou, but could not attain the Fits; neither would some of those Quakers own one of these persons, because she had not such Fits as they had, so she was forced to leave them. And the Cause why these Persons aforesaid could have no such Fits, it was because they had talked with me before they fell to the Quakers Principles, so that no Witchcraft-fit could be produced in them, though their Endeavours were great.

'Also I have drove the Witchcraft Power out of Quakers that have been strongly possess'd, so that they have never had Fit more. And as for you, Fox, have you ever had any Witchcraft-fit since you are damnd? Did you ever fall into a Swoon, and lye as one dumb? And hath the Spirit of Reason, the Devil, which you call the Light of Christ in you, I ask, hath he revealed any Mysteries of the Scriptures in the Time of your Fit, since you are damnd, fourteen Years ago? Is your Revelation of Reason to be seen in Writing, yea or nay.

'Again hath Samuel Hooton, William Smith, Edward Bourn, Richard Farnsworth, and many others that were damnd of late Years, have they had any Witchcraft-fits since? Or any new Revelation? If they have, let them be brought forth to the Light. Do you George Fox know any Quaker that I have pass'd the Sentence upon, that can produce a Witchcraft-fit afterwards? If no Fit can be produced as formerly, then I say no true Revelation nor Experience can arise in the Quakers Hearts: Nay, this Sentence, it puts a Stop to the Revelation of Reason also, else why should Quakers fall so, as you do, from your first Principle? For you are not like the People you were sixteen Years ago, there were few Quakers then but they had Witchcraft-fits, but now of late, I do not hear of any Quaker that hath any Fits, no, not so much as to buz or hum before the Fit comes. But if you Fox doth know any of you Quakers that have any of those Witchcraft-fits as formerly, bring them to me, or let me hear of it, and I shall cast out that Devil which causeth those Fits, so that they shall never have more, but shall be sensible and in their right Mind. So Fox, you shall find my Words to be Truth, and no Lie, that the Quakers, after the Sentence is pass'd upon them, shall never grow to have more Experience in Visions and Revelations, but shall wither. Do not you, Fox, find this to be true? If you do not, others will witness unto it to be true.

'But you say, "The Truth Spreads." I know the Truth spreads, but not the Quakers Witchcraft-fits, which produced Visions, Apparitions, and Revelations, which the Quakers thought had been produced by the Spirit of Christ, but they were produced by the Spirit of Reason the Devil, in themselves; and these Fits, Visions, Apparitions, and Revelations in the Quakers, are greatly withered away of late, by that Sentence I have pass'd upon the Speakers of the Quakers, and others of that Opinion, so that those Fits of theirs makes most People ashamed to own them, which formerly People thought them the most knowingest that was possess'd with a Witchcraft-fit; so that it is plain and clear, and many that were lovers of the Quakers

Way of Worship that can, and will witness, that their experience in Visions and Revelation are withered, and come to nothing.

'But Fox thinks because a many ignorant People comes to hear the Quakers speak their Ninny-nonies over and over again, therefore the Truth, as he calls it, spreads, but when it was at the best, it was but a Lie that spreads; indeed a Lye will spread very fast, but Truth spreads very slowly; for Truth was ten years in the World, and there was not much above forty Persons that owned it; but the Quakers at that Time had many Thousands that were Quakers.'—*Looking Glass for G. Fox*, p. 44.

This, as well as the history which has been previously given, is illustrated by the thirty-sixth chapter, from which we can take but a small portion—not only because part would be mere repetition, but because the coarseness of its language, and the nature of some of its details, are beyond what the present 'age can receive or bear.'

'If you Quakers were not wilfully ignorant and blind, you might see that this Commission of the Spirit, given to John Reeve and Muggleton, hath had great Power over the Ranters and Quakers. It hath broken the Ranters' principle all to Pieces, so that none dares hold up an Argument to defend it. You Quakers are also very much shattered, you are not like the People ye were sixteen Years ago; this, some that had a love for you, have seen and confessed.

'The Ranters, when we came out first, sixteen Years ago, were very high in their Elevations, in seeing of Visions, and going forth as Prophets and Prophetesses, and stripping themselves naked for Signs, as you Quakers have done. I can make it appear in some Particulars, that this Commission hath had great Power over Ranters and Quakers; for the Heads of these two were John Robins and John Taney. Robins was the Head of all false Christs, false Prophets, Prophetesses, Shakers, and Quakers; and you Quakers are but the Spawn of John Robins, and that Christ you own within you being a false Christ: John Robins was the Head of that Principle; also his Believers had those Witchcraft-fits upon them as you Quakers had, very strongly at that Time, when John Robins was in Power. Also John Taney was the Head of the Atheistical Ranters; and those Ranters were very high in their Language, and vile in their Practice. . . .

'Now do you, Fox, the Quaker, call to mind, and see whether his curse of Reeve and Muggleton hath not been over the Quakers' People, nor touched them? There hath a many Quaker been curst by us, but especially of late Years, by me. Have you yourself, Edward Borrows, Francis Howgal, you three were the first Quakers John Reeve damned; have you three had any Witchcraft-fits since? Have you foamed at the mouth, and swollen in your belly, with the workings of the Spirit, and, as you think, as if you had the Falling-sickness? Have you had any new Vision, or new Revelation in those Witchcraft-fits since? Yea, or nay?

'I am sure it hath great Power over you Quakers, and hath put a stop to those Witchcraft-fits; for I do not hear of any Quaker of late that hath any; though they were never curst by me; this Curse hath run in the line of the Heads of the Quakers, so that it doth put a Stop to the whole Body, so that none of the Members can produce a Witchcraft-fit; nay, the Quakers are bereft of all Revelation now, and Messages to the Magistrates; they have left off stripping themselves, naked, and imitating the prophets of old.'—*Ibid.* p. 98.

It is clear that this—or rather the work which contained this, and a great deal more—came upon the sect like a thunder-bolt. ‘This book,’ says Muggleton, ‘caused the Quakers to ‘be exceedingly angry at me, and several speakers of them to ‘write cursed letters unto me, and some of them came to ‘discourse with me.’ Their method of dealing with him, and attempting to put down his Power, was characteristic.

The first shot in return seems to have been fired by Elizabeth Hooton, who had every right to lead the van as one of George Fox’s first disciples, and apparently the earliest female preacher of the sect; and moreover the mother of friend Samuel, whose letter to ‘friend Judas’ we have just had occasion to notice. We know it, however, only from the answer, and it is charitable to her, though not, perhaps, just towards the subject of her wrath, to hope that she did not use quite such language as is ascribed to her.<sup>2</sup>

The next correspondent whom he names, was Thomas Loe, then a leading man in the sect, though less known to posterity than his convert, William Penn. ‘Thomas Loe, of Oxford, was one’ of the friends whom Elwood met in early days at Isaac Penington’s; ‘a faithful and diligent labourer he was in the ‘work of the Lord, and an excellent ministerial gift he had.’<sup>3</sup> And afterwards, when he was taken up, he says, ‘it pleased the ‘Lord to move the heart of my dear friend Thomas Loe, to ‘salute me with a very tender and affectionate letter.’<sup>4</sup> Certainly the letter with which Loe saluted Muggleton was of a very different description, and has a claim to notice as the production of William Penn’s teacher. Indeed it is so characteristic and illustrative of the times and the parties, that it would be injustice not to give it entire. It will be observed, that there is no denial of facts, no defence of doctrine or practice, no pretence of argument or reference to authority; it is mere bullying, a counter-cuff intended to out-face and put down the antagonist Power.

‘Lodowick Muggleton, having seen some of thy writings, more especially thy book entitled, “A Looking Glass,” which I have looked in, and do clearly see thy wicked, abominable, and anti-Christian spirit; and can do no less than cry, Oh! thou blasphemous, thou enemy of God, and of all righteousness; thou son of perdition, and child of the devil; how hast thou laboured to pervert the right way of God, in speaking of the blessed truth! And, Oh! thou seed of the serpent, and old sorcerer, how hast thou belied, slandered, wickedly and falsely accused and condemned, the just! And now, be it known unto thee, that thy false judgment, and wicked envy, both in speaking and writing against the servants of the living God, is returned back upon thy own head; and thee, with it, will God, in his fury and indignation, sink in the pit of darkness, from whence it hath risen. And in the

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 114.

<sup>2</sup> Elw Mem. p. 58.

<sup>3</sup> Sp. Epist. p. 228.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 67.



great and mighty Power of God and Christ, I Reprove, Judge, and Condemn thee, which shall stand upon thy Head; and thy Power, thou boastest so of, shall not reverse it. Oh! ignorant sot, how canst thou consider thy blasphemies, and not be ashamed. This is a Testimony in the Power and Spirit of God, against thee, and all thy wickedness, by a servant of Jesus Christ, who am a Witness of the Spirit and Power of God, with many others.<sup>1</sup>

'Whoever may read this letter,' says Muggleton, 'let them understand thus much, that I never saw the man, nor he me; but he reading the book aforesaid was moved by the light within him to send this cursed letter to me.' We have not Muggleton's answer, but he tells us that (as might, of course, be expected) it contained 'the Sentence.' Thomas Loe survived but a short time; and that fact Muggleton considered as a testimony to his own Power. The same idea, or the apprehension that it might occur to others, seems to have wrought on his opponents: for, very shortly after, the tailor was visited by two Quakers of no less importance than George Whitehead and Josiah Cole. In the conversation which ensued, Cole asked Muggleton to state what he considered it necessary for him to do in order to his salvation. Muggleton answered, 'to renounce Quakerism and believe in him.' 'Then,' he says,—

'Cole fell into a fit, and waited upon his own thoughts what to answer, and I waited for his answer. But George Whitehead perceived that Cole was in a strait, he came unto me, and spied a knot of ribbon upon my coat-sleeve, and said unto me, "Why dost thou wear this vanity?" and touched the ribbon with his fingers. I answered and said, "I know a piece of ribbon is a great sin in a Quaker's eye: but," said I, "why dost thou wear silk buttons on both thy coats?" He said, they were necessary: I said, "No, thou mightest wear hooks and eyes, claspes or eyletholes;" that was past by. "But then I will tell thee why I do wear ribbon, it is on purpose that I might not be taken, or thought to be a Quaker, for I do hate the Quakers' principle." With that Whitehead said, "Thou hatest all righteousness," and spake as if he himself, Cole and Fox, and others of the Quakers were writing a book against me, to make me manifest, which in a little time after it was set forth by William Pen, a Quaker; and further said, that they would post me up, and he slighted my Power and my God and said, he would trample my God and my Power under his feet as dirt, and tapped his foot upon the ground. Whereupon I did pronounce."<sup>2</sup>

What he pronounced will be easily imagined, and there is no good in needless repetition of such things; though if we are to have truth at all, they must be fairly outspoken, and plainly dealt with. The sentence roused Whitehead's companion:—

'With that Josiah Cole rose up with great zeal for his God within him, and said, "I told thee before that I would try thee and thy God," saying, that they were setting forth a writing against me, and, withal Cole pronounced many curses upon me, with his eyes dazzled with the witchcraft

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 114.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 118.

power in him, being disturbed with my words, it got up into his head. So that Whitehead and he both came near me with great threat'nings and judgments upon me, being both so full of curses : Cole cursed me into utter darkness, pit of darkness, chains of darkness, blackness of darkness, and that he would trample that God of mine, that was in the form of Man, under his feet, as dirt, and stamp'd his foot upon the ground, as the other devil did : Cole's curses were much, what like Thomas Loe, his curses in his letter to me.<sup>1</sup>

In a letter written while the facts were recent, Muggleton says :—' Cole pronounced many curses upon me, with his eyes full of dazzled babies in them ; and Whitehead, he came with great threatening of judgments upon me, they being so full of curses together that I can hardly tell what they said.'<sup>2</sup>

In a few days after the reciprocation of curses which has been described, Cole was ill. ' This,' says Muggleton, ' caused the Quakers' people to visit him very much, to know of him whether Muggleton's words had taken place in him, wondering that he should go out of the body so suddenly after Muggleton's sentence, as Thomas Loe did after his sentence. But he denied very stily that my words had no power over him, but that he had left me in chains of darkness. Nevertheless he grew worse and worse, so that the Quakers were not satisfied except he would go to the Peal in St. John's Street, at their Meeting-place, and give his testimony against Muggleton, before the people, to satisfy the ignorant Quakers, else they would judge that his Power in Loe and him was greater than the ministry of the Quakers. So they led him by the arms to the place aforesaid, and Josiah Cole wrote his Testimony, as followeth, exactly word for word.'<sup>3</sup>

But the story has become so strange that our readers may require some better evidence than that of one who has been introduced, and perhaps only known to them, as a mad and drunken tailor ; and therefore we will give George Fox's account of the matter. He states that about an hour and a half before Cole died, he called on him, and having cleared the room of all other persons, asked him if ' anything did lie upon him to write ' to Friends in England or elsewhere. To which Cole replied that ' he was clear of writing to them ; ' but he said ' that nothing did lie upon him. ' ' He did understand that I had a book in answer to Muggleton, and that when he was gone, Muggleton and his company would boast against him ; wherefore he desired that I would put a few words of his last Testimony against Muggleton in my book ; and I bade him write them out, for I was to go to see a friend hard by, and would come to him presently again, and at that time as he was sitting

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 120.<sup>2</sup> Sp. Epist. p. 243.<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 121.

'in his chair by the fire, he spoke them forth in the Power of the Lord God, as fresh as if he had ayled nothing, and a Friend took it in writing; which Testimony is inserted in the latter part of this book, that is of 'The Books and Epistles of Josiah Coale,' already quoted.

One cannot read the Testimony without hoping that the design and execution of it did not rest entirely with the poor Josiah; especially as Alexander Parker's Testimonial, prefixed to the book, affirms 'he was full of love to the last.' It is not, we hope, uncharitable to remark that, according to his own account, Fox contrived to be alone with Cole when the thing was proposed, and to be absent from him when it was executed. The document, however, as he gives it, is as follows:—

'Forasmuch as I have been informed that Lodowick Muggleton hath vaunted concerning my departure out of the body, because of his pretended sentence of damnation given against me; I am moved to leave this Testimony, concerning him, behind me: viz. "That he is a son of darkness, and a co-worker with the Prince of the bottomless pit; in which his inheritance shall be for ever." And the judgment I passed on him, when with him, stands seal'd by the Spirit of the Lord, by which I then declar'd unto him, "That in the name of that God, that spanneth the heaven with his span, and measureth the waters in the hollow of his hand, I bind thee here on earth, and thou art bound in heaven; and in the chain under darkness to the Judgment of the great day thou shalt be reserved: and thy faith and strength, thou boastest of, I defie, and trample under foot." And I do hereby further declare the said Lodowick to be a false prophet, in what he said to me at that time, who told me, "That from henceforth I should be always in fear of damnation, which should be a sign to me, that I was damned;" which fear I was never in since; so that his sign given by himself did not follow his prophesie, which sufficiently declares him to be a false prophet.

'JOSIAH COALE.'

This testimony of Cole does not, however, appear to have been sufficient to satisfy the Quaker mind. But before we go further, we cannot help reminding the reader that the George Fox of whom we are reading, though the same person of whom we read before that he deserted his family and friends, is now full five and twenty years older. We are not looking at the rampant fanaticism of a wild peasant lad. Quakerism was not quite in its cradle in 1668, and those who had been in it half as long as it had existed, had had time to look about them, and consider. We make this remark because people sometimes seem to forget that the earliest years of a dynasty, a kingdom, or an institution of any kind, actually consisted of as many hours and minutes as the more recent ones; but as to the next of his correspondents, Muggleton says, 'In the same year came another thundering letter from a Lyon-like Quaker, being a learned man brought up at the University; his name is William

'Pen; here is the copy of it verbatim.' It is too long to be given entire, but part will suffice. After speaking of Coale, of his labours and impaired health, and charging Muggleton with having manifested an insulting spirit on his death, he says:—

'I say, being sensible of thy vaunts, and it now being laid upon me, Therefore once more I come in the name and authority of that dreadful Majesty, which fills heaven and earth, to speak on this wise: Boast not, thou enemy of God, thou Son of Perdition, and Confederate with the unclean, croaking spirits reserved under chains to eternal darkness; for in the everlasting glorious Light thou despisest, thou art seen arraigned, tried, condemned and sentenced for a lying spirit, and false prophet, who, having counterfeited the commission and seal of that God, whom the Heaven cannot contain, hath bewitched a few poor silly souls; but their blood, oh! Muggleton, lies at thy door, and the wrath of the Almighty is kindled against thee, and his eternal Power in his servants the Quakers came, whom thou hast passed thy envious curse, shall suddenly grind thee to powder; and, as formerly, so again on the behalf of the God of the Quakers whom I worship, I boldly challenge thee, with thy six-foot God, and all the host of luciferian spirits, with all your commissions, curses, and sentences, to touch or hurt me; practice your skill and power! Behold, I stand in a holy defiance of all your enmity and strength: And this know oh! Muggleton, with thy God art chained, by the Spirit of the Lord, and on you I trample in his everlasting dominion, and to the bottomless pit are you sentenced, from whence you came, and where the endless worm shall know and torture your imaginary soul to eternity.

'Written, signed, and sealed by commission, received about the first hour of the eleventh morning of the twelfth month 1668, from the glorious majesty of the Most High God, who fills heaven and earth, that lives in his servant,

'WILLIAM PEN, JUNIOR.'

However morally injurious any of these curses may have been when they 'came back to roost,' it will hardly be thought that they had power to hurt those against whom they were uttered. Josiah Coale seems to have been less terrible in fact, than in the brags of William Penn and the poetess. Muggleton and Whitehead can scarcely be supposed to have materially abbreviated each other's lives. The former (notwithstanding the maledictions of his opponents, and worse dangers by Judge Jeffries and the pillory) reached his eighty-ninth year, and the latter his eighty-seventh.

The poor tailor, instead of being suddenly ground to powder, received—though not until after nearly four years—another letter from the Lyon-like Quaker, in a very different style and tone. Friends seem to have found that their way of going on did not answer; and William Penn—the only man, we believe, among them who could have dreamed of such a mode of proceeding—thought it might be well to try what a little show of argument and learning could do. Accordingly, he put forth a

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 125.

work entitled 'The New Witnesses proved Old Hereticks; or 'Information to the Ignorant,' &c.

In this work he undertook to show that the doctrines set forth as new discoveries by Reeve and Muggleton had been held in early times, and stigmatized as heretical. This, so far as his adversary was concerned, was a very gratuitous trouble. Muggleton said—and it would have been well if he had said nothing else, for it was his whole case in a nutshell, and put with admirable plainness, brevity, and candour—'For my part, 'I never saw any of those books he speaks of, neither did I ever 'read any of those points they condemn for heresy. We never 'read no books but the Bible.'

Without entering into the controversy, we may just observe that the letter, to which we have already alluded, is in the highest degree insulting and contemptuous; but it is not in the 'Ereles vein.' The fine gentleman, now in a state of transition into the learned polemic, is not going to 'tear a cat,' but only to explain why he has stooped to meddle with the creature. It begins:—

---

<sup>1</sup> Answer to Penn, p. 122.

It would, to be sure, have been better if they had occasionally consulted other books which have been written to illustrate the Bible. John Reeve understood the divine declaration, Genesis xi. 6—'Nothing will be restrained from them which they have *imagined* to do'—to imply an admission that the Babel-builders could (and would, if not restrained) have carried out their *imagination* of building a tower which should reach to heaven. As far as he knew, philosophers conceived that the clouds were about three miles from the earth; and he gave the men of Babel credit for knowing this by the eye; 'and so,' he went on 'they imagined that the firmament could not be above three miles higher,' or they could not have dreamed of making a tower to reach it. By these and other equally valid arguments, it seems, John Reeve endeavoured to persuade Mr. Richard Leader, a New England man somewhat addicted to astrology, that the heavens generally were not more than six miles from the earth. An account of the matter will be found in 'The Acts of the Witnesses,' p. 58, and 'The Stream from the Tree of Life,' p. 38. We do not see that Reeve said anything in particular of the *distance* of the sun; but here, and elsewhere, he maintained that it was not much greater than it appeared to be. In his 'Sacred Remains,' he says, (not very intelligibly) 'about the bigness of a square chamber' (p. 62, and see 92). We do not know that Muggleton ever expressed an opinion on any such point. As we notice this matter in reference to Lord Macaulay's statement, it is right to add that the discussion seems to have been carried on not only without cursing, but in the most friendly manner; and that Mr. Leader 'showed kindness unto John Reeve all the days of his life,' and also 'grew very mighty in wisdom and knowledge, both in natural and spiritual wisdom; so that every great man of his acquaintance did submit unto his wisdom, and lov'd him for his knowledge.'<sup>1</sup> The long and short of the matter is, that Lord Macaulay has mistaken one of these unhappy men for the other. It certainly is not very material; for we believe that any charges made against the moral character of either would be mere calumny. Their hallucination was lamentable, their heresies were absurd and detestable; but we believe that they were honest, sober, and industrious men.

---

<sup>1</sup> Acts of Wit. p. 61.

' L. Muggleton !

' The sense of thy ungodly and blasphemous practices (though otherwise an adversary of little moment), and their influence upon some poor, miserable, dark, and ignorant souls, begot in me a desire to detect thee, that being laid open to the view of such as foolishly think thy dreams and impostures worth a viewing, and which is worse, a believing too ; God may be justified in their judgment, and myself clear of their blood in the day of the Lord,' &c.'

By the time that Penn wrote this, ' Friends ' had ' lost the Power,' which it never regained. What has since wandered about the world under the name of Quakerism, is but its ghost. Who that has seen, even in imagination, or Mrs. Greer's description, Joseph John, and his sister Elizabeth, at Ennis-corthy, quite aground, and almost in fits, for want of four horses to draw their coach, would guess that they were the spiritual seed, and admiring followers, of the ' man in leathern breeches,' who tramped barefoot through the snow, making ' stands,' and crying, ' Woe to the bloody city of Lichfield.' Yet who can doubt that if, while fighting for his leaders, Joseph John had been asked why he could not take off his hat, or say, ' good day,' to Miss Strangman, he would have reverentially pointed to the *ipse dixit* of George Fox ?

What can be more sad than the caricature of early zeal which remains among a body once so uncontrollably fervent. The same number of the *Friend*, which we have quoted respecting the Wellington hat-bands, contains a ' Testimony ' of the monthly meeting of New York, concerning our beloved ' friend Elizabeth Coggeshall.' It tells us, ' that this young married woman, about twenty-seven years of her age, became mightily impressed with an apprehension that it would be required of her to make a *religious visit to friends* in England, Ireland, and the continent of Europe.' We give her full credit for godly sincerity when she says, that her ' strong will was much opposed ' to public ministration, and speaks of it as a ' most solemn engagement, calling for such deep preparation of heart ! leading to such creaturely reduction.' All things considered, one is really disposed to pity, more than we blame her, when she writes, ' After a time of deep heart-suffering, I was made willing to leave a sweet babe about thirteen months old, my beloved parents, and dear relatives and friends ; and in addition to this, I had not seen my affectionate husband for more than seven months ; but was enabled through the Lord's

---

<sup>1</sup> Penn's Works, vol. i. p. 46.



'holy aid and assistance, to leave my home with more fortitude than could have been expected.' A note informs us that her husband was a sea-faring man, who 'had expressed his approbation of her being faithful to this prospect of religious duty.' And we are afterwards told that, 'among the trials to which our dear friend, in inscrutable wisdom was subjected,' one was, 'that her husband sailed for England a short time before her return. In consequence of which, and of his absence at the time of her leaving home, they were separated about four years.'

But take it at its best, or its worst, what a poor thing is 'a religious visit to friends,' in these days. Think of the heroine 'whose name according to the world is Jane Stokes, who was commanded of the Lord for to go to the place where John Perrot was,'—that is, as he dated his letters, 'Rome Prison of madmen,'—and who did go 'in weakness and sore pains,' and 'entered into captivity,' being 'retained' by the Inquisition. Think of Isabel Buttery, who came from the north to London, dispersing George Fox's books, so that she was brought before the Lord Mayor, when 'her spirit was valiantly carried out,' insomuch that my Lord Mayor subjected her to 'creaturely reduction' in Bridewell. Think of our friends Katharine Evans and Sarah Chevers, when the 'drawings in their minds to travel towards Alexandria,'<sup>1</sup> got them into the Maltese dungeons, and they were lying on the floor of their cell to suck in air under the door, while Gilbert and Lord Obaney were compassing their enlargement; and they too had husbands and children; and beside letters to the inquisitor and Friar Malachy, Katharine wrote one prodigiously long one, which is directed, 'For the hands of John Evans, my right dear and precious husband, with my tender-hearted children, who are more dear and precious to me than the apple of mine eye.' Think of Mary Fisher, 'a religious maiden,' who has been already mentioned, and who might have been introduced as having been one of the first couple of Quakeresses who landed in New England, before she 'found herself concerned to go with a message from the Lord, as she believed, to Sultan Mahomet the Fourth,'<sup>2</sup>—and how when she came to Adrianople, she acquainted some of the citizens with her intent, and desired them to go with her, but they not daring so to do, for fear of the Sultan's displeasure, she went to the camp alone, and procured information to be made at the Grand Vizier's tent, that there was an English woman who had something to

---

<sup>1</sup> Sew. 293.

<sup>2</sup> Berse II. 394.

declare from the Great God to the Sultan; who sent her word that she should speak with him the next morning. So she returned to the city that night, and next morning went back to the camp, when the Sultan being with his great men about him, as he uses to be when he receives ambassadors, sent for her in, and asked her, whether it was so as he had heard, viz. that she had a message from the Lord? She answered, 'Yea.' Then he bade her speak on (having three interpreters by him), and when she stood silent a little, waiting on the Lord when to speak, he, supposing that she might be fearful to utter her mind before them all, asked her, 'Whether she desired that any of them might go forth before she spake?' She answered 'Nay.' Then he bade her speak the word of the Lord to them, and not to fear, for they had good hearts, and could hear it, and strictly charged her to speak the word she had to say from the Lord, neither more nor less, for they were willing to hear it be it what it would. Then she speaking, they all gave diligent attention with much seriousness and gravity till she had done; and then the Sultan asked her, 'Whether she had any more to say?'<sup>1</sup> She asked, 'Whether he understood what she had said?' He replied, 'Yea, every word,' adding, that it was truth, and desired her to stay in that country, saying, 'that they could not but respect such an one, as had taken so much pains to come to them so far as from England, with a message from the Lord, and offered her a guard to bring her to Constantinople, whither she intended to go,' which she not accepting, but trusting in the arm of the Lord, who had brought her safe thither, to conduct her back again, he told her, 'It was dangerous travelling, especially for such an one as she, and wondered that she had passed safe so far as she had, saying, it was respect and kindness to her, that he had offered her a guard, and that he would not for any thing that she should come to the least hurt in his dominions.' . . . And so she departed through that great army to Constantinople without a guard, and came thither without the least hurt, scorn or derision; the Turks in this behalf receiving her and her message with far more respect and civility than she had often met with from those who covered themselves with a profession of Christianity.

Such things as we have already said, really were 'peculiarities;' but we must not let such comparisons draw us into a discussion of modern Quakerism. A strong feeling is abroad, and rather a brisk controversy has been raised. Whether

---

<sup>1</sup> Besse II. 394.

'Young Quakerism' of the nineteenth century will be able to break the yoke imposed on it by 'Young Quakerism' of the seventeenth, remains to be seen. Should it succeed, may it be in sobriety, and the fear of God; and may the grotesque imagery of, perhaps, the most grotesque hero-worship that has ever prevailed, be cleared off in a way becoming those who profess to be lovers of peace and good-will to men. In the mean time, we must repeat that the matter cannot be understood, or fairly dealt with, either by those within or those without the pale of the Society, who have not bestowed some inquiry and reflection on the origin and the originators of the peculiarities.

---

ART. II.—1. *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society.* First, Second, and Third Series. Boston, U.S.

2. *The Virginians.* By W. M. THACKERAY. Bradbury and Evans. 1859.

3. *Life of George Washington.* By WASHINGTON IRVING. John Murray. 1857.

4. *Mary Howitt's History of the United States of America.* Longman and Co. 1859.

SOME countries, like some wines, become old and mellow, or vapid and effete, as it may be, with age, while others, their contemporaries, are now effervescing with youth. How few there are of the Englishmen who read, think, or talk of America, with its bustling freedom, and somewhat parvenu-like ostentation of prosperity, who linger in thought for a moment on a portion of that seemingly ever new country, now heavy and worn down with all the corruptions of an European empire. Yet Virginia, the Old Dominion, exhibits as varied a series of national fortunes, and as full a development of social and political character, as any ancient realm in our hemisphere. Long and doubtful was its struggle into life. Storms seemed to blow which have never raged since, and new forms of disease were discovered, as though to balance, in proper tragic antithesis, the Eden-like beauties which revealed themselves to the admiring eyes of North Devon mariners. The contrast is a strange one between the glory and luxuriant beauty of these southern regions of the New World, as presenting themselves to the eyes of the first discoverers, and the aspect which they showed to the same men become regular residents, and no longer casual guests. The sunny air is a parching Arabian atmosphere; the zephyrs, sharp withering breezes; pleasant, shadowy woods, gloomy jungles; and bright flowers, the poor apologies for west country grain and orchards.

It was only after many calamitous expeditions, equipped under the auspices of one of those heroes of our history who hover strangely between the King Arthurs and the Marlboroughs, between romance and prose, Sir Walter Raleigh, the gallant who spoiled a cloak, and the somewhat jesuitical co-plotter with atheists and seminary priests, that at length a little village slowly emerged on the banks of the broad James. But still fresh bands of eager adventurers flocked in. In vain they met their predecessors in full retreat, despairing and disgusted, their harvests grubbed up, and their huts in ruins.

As they floated up those glorious Virginian estuaries, they forgot all evil auspices. 'Their senses were ravished,' writes one of themselves, 'with the beauty of the prospect, the 'fragrancy of fields and gardens, the brightness of the sky, and 'serenity of the air,' till they exclaimed that no two European realms could approach the rich abundance and luxuriance of this. The flaunting crown imperial, the cardinal flower, the mocassin flower, and the tulip tree, were on every side; not in gardens, but in the woods, running wild. Malochotons and cherries and peaches were there, too many for any but the hogs to eat; and, in short, 'scarce a flower or a fruit exists, which 'does not flourish better in Virginia than even its own native 'soil.' Gradually, even wealth poured in. The scent of that dreary looking weed, tobacco, began to loom full on the European palate. The Grand Turk and the Tartars of Samarcand themselves appreciated the discovery. The Virginian Company condescended, though reluctantly, to 'this degradation of the Virginian glebe,' relinquishing grand visions of rivalry with Potosi, Italian silkworms, and French vineyards; and James I. gave up devoting his leisure to 'Blasts, and Counterblasts,' abandoned his paternal fears lest 'one hundred thousand English rustics should smoke at the plough,' and betook himself to the more serious task of devising how to turn the new taste into the most profitable vehicle of taxation.

Before the Revolution, the social condition of the tide-water region of Virginia was well known to the merchants of Liverpool and Bristol, who were often the guests of the planters on the shores of those great highways, the James and the Potomac. We do not possess that knowledge. The present highways and railways pass far on one side of this once famous territory. Guide-books totally ignore it; and even Americans themselves seem scarcely to understand the nature of this division of Virginia, or its inhabitants. While the whole land has lost its pre-eminence in the Union, this district has in its own State lost its relative rank. Formerly, it was everything; and its history the history of Virginia. It included the shores of the great rivers for a couple of hundred miles, or more, into the interior, and was fringed with spacious mansions, up to the very doors of which frigates could sail, and great merchantmen, with the fashions of London to exchange for the renowned sweet Virginian tobacco. Even the sea-breezes showed it favouritism; they were then never felt above Williamsburg; now they are welcomed, at close of midday, in the hot woods, on the slopes of the first mountains. Out of the whole number of members returned to the first Congress by the State, a great majority came from

thence; now it sends but an inconsiderable minority. Thence sprang all the leading men, foremost in the Union as in Virginia, of the epoch of the Revolution, and there they lived. Patrick Henry himself, the practical Radical and democrat, dwelt just on its verge. Now all that is changed. The life and vigour of the land, as seen at least in politics, has oozed away from the tidal territory. Tobacco, the staple of Virginian trade and wealth, requires a virgin soil (though the peasant proprietor of the Bergstrasse cannot, apparently, afford to hold any such doctrine), and so the capitalist is ever removing farther and farther into the interior. His exhausted plantation he leaves to become a wilderness of cedars, oaks, wild vines, tulip and judas trees, strawberries, azaleas, and roses, pasturage for hosts of butterflies and humming-birds. The West receives the owner, or the region beyond the barrier of the Blue Mountains, which then, as being occupied by Irishmen, interposed an insuperable obstacle to the fastidious Virginian planter. New counties were, even in those historical times of the land, ever in process of formation in the West. Thus, Albemarle had originally been a portion of Gooch County, and the latter, the native district of Jefferson, itself a fragment of another.

A further explanation may be, that, though the great men of Virginia previously and in the earlier times of the Revolution did condescend to interfere in politics, the hope of real influence and power has now drifted so far beyond their principles and sort of statesmanship that, in common with the rest of their own rank in the Union, they are not heard of, not because they have ceased to exist, but because they no longer take the same interest in national politics which they once took in affairs in which their counsels were paramount. Neither the mass of native Americans, nor wandering tourists know of their habits of life and thought, because the former have no opportunity of studying them in the arena of Congress, while the ebbing of tobacco cultivation, and of curiosity towards the West leads the latter also off in that direction. But, along the course of these mighty streams, may still be seen 'large piles of irregular architecture, and quaint turrets and gables, which we think more 'consonant to the oak and beech, among the hickory, black 'walnut, and acacia.' The same broad fields, and farms deserving the name of manors, still surround them; and many old names linger about. The estates in this region continue, spite of the repeal of the law of entails, to have the proportions of great English domains, many containing ten thousand acres. They are cultivated by great gangs of negroes, and the houses are filled with servants.

Though the land is generally poor, the course of the



great rivers and their tributaries is marked by a fertile strip of country, sown now usually with maize, cotton, and palma Christi, and bounded, at a mile's distance, by the dreary forests of interminable black pitch-pine. This is more peculiarly the character of the James. Forty-three miles from its source it is fourteen miles broad, a sort of inland sea indeed. The edging of dark fir and cedar of various sombre tints on its shores appears, at first, to grow out of the water; so low is the surrounding level. After a time, the banks, still at a great elevation, begin to display soil of a good quality, covered thickly with the mulberry, walnut, and sycamore. Every now and then a great house comes into view, and, as though the whole land were not a vast forest round about, one is sure to find planted by English-squire's instincts dreary columns of Lombardy poplars. The Potomac flows through more picturesque scenery; and the magnificent falls bordered by huge black cliffs, a combination of Alpine grandeur with tropical vegetation, its great bluffs and long wooded ridges throwing massy shadows over the broad silent river on towards the rich shores of Maryland, make the mind forget the Dutch-like prospects in the lower district. It does not, however, water a larger breadth of fertile land on the whole. All through those flat alluvial regions stretches the broad belt of Pine Barrens, running parallel to the coast through the Atlantic Plain, overspread with gigantic long-tufted firs. Wherever they give way, are found swamps clothed richly with evergreen oak and cypress, with wild vines clinging round the trunks, and their branches hung with the white berries of the misletoe. The largest has the famous name of the Great Dismal. It is forty miles long and fifteen broad, and is described as looking like an inundated river plain, the water vibrating with a sort of mysterious current, and the whole fen being higher than the dry land round. Great trunks of fallen trees lie beneath a dense deposit of peat in the interior, and a rich carpet of moss spreads over the surface. The efforts of Washington set on foot a series of canals through the midst; and now and then a boat emerges from under the overarching aisles into the central lake, Drumond's Pool, while the occasional snarl of a wolf, and the crash of boughs dragged down by a bear in quest of acorns, blends mysteriously with the sighing of the cedars.

The very barrenness of the chief part of the district, and the narrow limits within which all industry was confined, cherished, as though in a hothouse, the prosperity of the tide-water plantations. They were kept perforce to the very bounds within which the stir of trade could most readily find them. In the days of Governor Berkeley, and partly in consequence of the sympathy between the settlers and that fiery old cavalier, this

region had become rich and prosperous. In 1649, we learn from a description of the settlement given by a gentleman in a letter to a friend in England, that it had so increased as then to contain 15,000 English, including the king's occasional presents to the Company of a hundred or two of 'dissolute persons,' and 300 negroes. There were 2,000 head of cattle, and swine ranging the woods innumerable. Thirty ships, with a complement in all of a thousand sailors, sailed up the estuaries in autumn, returning with their freight of tobacco in March. The land was full of valuable timber, often sixty feet high and three square, with no underwood, so that the cumbrous coaches-and-six of the period could make their way through the forest. Already the orchards, in parts, had begun to bear as richly as in Herefordshire, and cider was added to the excellent metheglin, the result of the flowers which the bees, we are assured, found, notwithstanding their brightness and pretentiousness, 'most excellent food.' So late as Oldmixon's time, about the close of the seventeenth century, when the population had now grown to 70,000, pork 'the best in the world,' and capons, might be had almost for the asking, and deer sold at eight shillings the head. It was reckoned that the tobacco trade was at the latter period carried on in fifty ships in the year from Liverpool alone, and in the same, or a yet larger number from Bristol, which paid on their cargoes 60,000*l.* to the revenue yearly, while at least a hundred sailed from the Thames.

In such a land capital soon made its weight felt, and the richest portions of the country on the banks of each of the four great rivers were soon parcelled out among from ten to thirty planters dwelling in ample houses, not much farther apart than in a rural district of the mother-country; and there keeping open house, 'every one's contempt falling upon the sordid wretch who should offend against that laudable custom of the country,' says Oldmixon. 'In England,' he continues, 'a hospitable man is reckoned a sot or a bubble, and hearty feasts are thought disreputable. But not so among the prudent, careful (*sic*), generous, hospitable people of Virginia.' Of this class, so early as 1649, was 'that worthy Captain Matthews, one of the council, and a most deserving *Commonwealth's man* (not necessarily one in arms against King Charles), who hath a fine house, and keeps weavers and a tan-house, with eight shoemakers, and forty negro servants, whom he brings up to trade. His wheat he selleth at four shillings the bushel, kills store of beeves, and sells them to victual the ships, hath abundance of kine, and a brave dairy.' In fine, 'with his wife, the daughter of Sir Thomas Hamilton, he keeps a good house, lives bravely, is a true lover of Virginia, and is

‘worthy of much honour.’—*New State of Virginia*. Such were the hearty merchant-farmers of Virginia of the first generation, with some of the refinements of courtiers conjoined with the adventurousness of West of England mariners. In his own ships and from his own wharves the rich land-owner laded for Bristol the full tobacco crop grown on his own lands. Meantime, he entertained nobly at his house the merchant or supercargo the whole winter through, gathering up tales of popular resistance to prerogative at home.

He was as keen a champion of popular rights as any feudal baron struggling for Magna Charta, or a Derbyshire or Cheshire squire fretting under the sway of a Chatsworth or an Eaton. His views of the *denotation* of those popular rights and liberties were much the same as theirs. It is indeed very hard to take in at a glance both sides of his character. The planters, more particularly those of the second generation, formed a sort of nation of De Medici merchants; men, that is, spending on pleasure and luxury the profits, and often something more, of a hundred adventures; and while in the relation to one set of men of liberal democratic traders, holding to another that of despots and task-masters. The spectacle of a Leicestershire fox-hunter, overseeing a troop not only of negroes, but of whites, now convicts from the hulks, now cavaliers, Commonwealth men, or Jacobites, whichever cause was uppermost in England, would not be a pleasant *tableau*. It was bad enough at all events. But these careless Transatlantic squires, who loved no sport in which the dangers of a fox-chase were not exaggerated, hunting wild horses in the interval of a drinking-bout, and dashing about over roads as bad as English highways in the reigns of the Stuarts, and of which the streets of New Norfolk, with mud so copious as to float a boat, would even now be a kind of type, managed to keep the two characters agreeably apart, by transferring, with the very easiest of consciences, all of the slave-owner's attributes, but his profits, to their bailiffs, clerks, and stewards. They themselves, far from brandishing the whip, were discussing, over thrice-voyaged madeira, or strong Cheshire ale, or in the Parliament-house of Williamsburg, or its many coffee-houses, the equality of man, and the limits of prerogative.

Above all, they were opposed to anything like centralization. This was their great bugbear, both before the Revolution and after it. They are now always keeping watch and ward over menaced motions for improving a road, or building a bridge in their State. Formerly the establishment of fixed *dépôts* of trade was their pet object of aversion and assault. In vain did Charles II. command Governor Berkeley to get a law passed in the Colonial Legislature for all ships to unlade at Jamestown, and for the

building of forts for that purpose, and to guard against breaches of the Act of Navigation. Both merchants and planters were obstinately opposed to any such policy. The former knew that it would not be for their interest that great marts should arise, at which the growers might lessen the real intensity of the demand for the tobacco crop, instead, as under the then system, of being entirely dependent on the bid of a single ship-owner, who had obtained a monopoly, in many cases, by lending large sums on the security of the harvest for many years to come. They were also disinclined to resign their very pleasant sojourn of three or four months amid the luxuries of a planter's mansion. A well-introduced tourist may still, in Virginia, test the force of this latter motive. The planters, on the other hand, were, on their estates, as absolutely independent as an old Norman lord of a manor. Each estate had its appropriate name, not being called, as in the north, such and such a lot in such a township. They went up to the seat of government to spend the season together, to dine merrily at taverns, and to fête or be fêted by a popular nobleman and his wife. But they were as averse to resign their squirearchical rank for that of regular residents in a small country town, as would be a set of Highland lairds or English county families.

They hated the appearance of centralization: and nothing in appearance with less of centralization could have existed than the Virginian system. The Governor or his deputy lived in a palace, had his guards, titles, and a salary liberal enough to tempt English peers. He could veto acts of the Assembly, and appoint colonels of militia, and lords-lieutenant of counties. He was lord-general, and high admiral, chancellor, chief justice, and his own prime minister. Yet no government could be less of an absolutism than that in its practical working. The whole body of planters had, it is true, a species of national pride in the name of Virginians, and they manifested an apathy, which betrayed even a secret pleasure, whenever the tobacco trade of rival Maryland, or the commerce of New York or New England was supposed to be in peril. But, virtually, at least so far as they cared for aught beyond the verge of their estates, their cares were bounded by their several counties, and the county *régime* was modelled in the way to gratify their dislike of the very appearance of dependence. The county courts of Virginia certainly appear, even at the present time, till we have got a clear insight into the character of Virginian democracy, an anomaly in the constitution of that State. 'The number of magistrates composing them,' we learn from a native writer (Tucker) on political economy and government, 'is kept up from persons nominated by the courts themselves. It is true that the exe-

‘cutive of the State has the power of rejecting the nominations of the county courts; but, as the public necessity for the magistrates may be very pressing, and as the motives to reject can seldom be so strong as to induce the executive power to put itself into collision with the court, the recommendation is virtually an appointment. There has not been a rejection perhaps in one case in a thousand. The consequence is, that the power is substantially possessed by the courts, and is concentrated in a few families, who naturally endeavour to strengthen and perpetuate their influence and authority. They have criminal jurisdiction in all cases of misdemeanor, the power of acquittal in all cases of felony, the power of nominating, which is equivalent to that of appointing, all militia officers below the rank of brigadiers, and of making all the lucrative county appointments, as well as to fill up the vacancies in their own body; the high sheriff is taken from the body every two years, and then returns to it; they have the power of levying poll taxes for county purposes; they establish or put down all the roads and bridges. There is no individual in the county who may not be made to feel their power or ill will.’ And yet ‘the great mass of State politicians regard these oligarchical courts as the anchor of safety to the State, which has hitherto kept her to her moorings, in spite of the shifting currents of opinion, and would keep her against the driving tempest of popular fury.’ The institution is, in fact, a matter of boast and pride to the Virginians; and this, as far as we can see, simply on account of the institution being a peculiarity of their country.

It was not by standing forward boldly as the people’s representatives, that the great Virginian houses attained their influence. It was their own by right of property. In many cases they were most unpopular with the yeomanry, ‘philip-pizing,’ says Jefferson, somewhat in a partisan spirit, ‘in every collision between king and people, with a view to a seat in the council,’ so that after the Revolution made their ancestral honours a reproach, ‘a Randolph, a Carter, or a Burwell must have great personal superiority over a common competitor to be elected even at this day.’ Few great Virginian planters had made their own fortunes. Fortune-making was no quality which flourished on Virginian soil. It was enough if they kept what family interest at home had procured for them by lavish royal grants. It is all very well for Oldmixon, that notorious perverter of facts, to declaim about there being ‘no need of a Heralds’ Office at Jamestown, the honest merchant and industrious planter being the men of honour in Virginia.’ He himself confesses, that when the condition of

the settlement began to improve, 'many men of small fortunes but good families, came out.' There was country gentleman's blood in their veins, and the instinct in their hearts, that the serious business of life for their class was pleasure. They defied royal governors and orders of Boards of Trade, when the question was between them and these,—but it was quite otherwise when the other relations of society were the subject of controversy. Both Oldmixon and Defoe confound Maryland and Virginia. The latter even declares, in 'Colonel Jack,' that 'Maryland is Virginia, speaking of them from a distance.' In the former indeed it was different; but in Virginia, those who began life as yeomen seem to have, as a rule, always left to their descendants the same status; and so it was with the great planters.

It was in right of their apparent possessions and landed interest, and, in short, the prestige of their ancestors' wealth, that they maintained their pre-eminence, and not of their actual riches. The great families of the country received but few accessions from within, to compete with and outshine them. Their estates were eaten up with all the cancers of an old landed system, which they had imported with them from England to a new world. They were burdened with many mortgages, liens, settlements on younger children, elegits, statutes, and the like, while they were generally so fast tied up that the soil could never get freed by passing into other hands. The possessors themselves might be treated with the greatest insolence by the merchants, their guests, and creditors, who were in a very different state of discipline to that which they were subject to in New England. But, as between themselves and their countrymen, they maintained their superiority as fully and freely as ever Irish landowner besieged in his dilapidated castle, before the iron age of the Encumbered Estates Court. They bore their dignity by no means meekly. If, in these days, northerners are forced to confess that, though the majority, 'they are held in political thralldom by the southern planters,' from the greater leisure the latter can devote to matters fruitless in dollars, than the small farmers and merchants of New York and New England, and also from their superior power of 'banding together as one man in defence of what they call 'their property and institutions, their general eloquence and 'political tact, and the high bearing, which often imposes on 'northern men, much superior to them in real talent, knowledge, and strength of character' (Sir Charles Lyell), much more was this the case in those old times, when they had only the lower orders of their fellow Virginians to domineer over. At home they saw none but courteous or complaisant guests,



obsequious overseers, or silent bondsmen, of whom they occasionally held a levée, seated on high, as Defoe describes it, in a large hall, 'like a lord judge on the bench, or a petty king on his throne!' The interests of the first were the same with their own, and they only met as they still do to sympathise in an outcry against the Government, or to dance away the long summer evenings. The last they ruled with a rod of iron; for these jovial olive-hued squires could, without a thought, commit the extreme power of torture into the hands of men proverbially cruel. They did not concern themselves with the fate of the last purchase from the convict-ship. It might sometimes be an abandoned fellow, sent to contaminate the tobacco-fields; sometimes a chivalrous gentleman from Preston, transported for the very cause planters loved to drink on their knees success to. Sometimes it might even be a kidnapped child, or honest peasant. They recked not. To neighbours not of the same degree with their own they behaved with extreme hauteur. The *half-breeds*, as the biographer of Patrick Henry assures us, the younger scions of great families were styled, were just admitted within the circle, not as members, but appendages. The integral constituents of the order formed a true oligarchy, defined, that is, by wealth as well as birth. The few who had raised themselves from a servile, or at all events from a dependent condition, could not hope to be admitted till, by the third generation, they had purged away the stain of their ancestors' honest exertions. The substantial independent yeomanry, 'looking askance at, but not jostling their betters,' were treated by their chiefs as only made to pay taxes.

In reference to tax-paying liabilities, this aristocracy claimed no foremost place. While appealing ever to their wealth (itself often a fiction) as their title to power, they provided for the public expenditure by a capitation tax; the expense, a heavy one, of making the roads was borne equally by all males over sixteen. They absorbed a considerable portion of the income when collected. By having the right of suffrage limited to freeholders, they insured, for the most part, the return of the nominees of themselves. There was as fine a show of the recognition of popular privileges at an election of a burgess as in Westmoreland. There was a great deal of band-playing, and a vast amount of drinking at the candidates' expense; but the poorer freeholders were so generally as deep in debt to the richer, who were in the habit of supplying them with goods imported by them, as were these to the merchants, that the free choice was a mere farce. The leading landowners selected *their* representatives, and then they paid them out of the contributions of the masses an exorbitant remuneration for devoting

their time to defending their own monopoly against the prerogative of the Crown as represented by the Governor. During the reign of Charles I., when the aristocracy was entirely absolute, the salary was, for each day of attendance, 150 lbs. of tobacco (the common currency of the tide-water region), and 100 lbs. more for the maintenance of a horse and servant; that is, altogether, about twenty-five dollars daily. It is manifest that it was only actual dread of the official and territorial influence of the aristocracy which kept them at the head of affairs, and not a feeling of affection, from the circumstance that one of the chief complaints of young Colonel Bacon, in his insurrectionary manifesto, was based on this extravagantly high salary. They retorted, no doubt with much truth, that his object,—one of themselves as he was by birth and fortune,—was the selfish one of obtaining a monopoly of the Indian trade. Governor Berkeley, who, we are told, ruled as 'a Governor with a landed interest,' made common cause with the aristocrats; but the Royal Commissioners sent out to examine into the causes of the rebellion reported so decidedly against the amount, that it was reduced. It still, however, continued so high as to be a perpetual source of murmuring among the farmers, and a good electioneering cry for the Crown. Thus, James II., on a recommendation from the Privy Council being rejected by the Assembly, took care to insinuate that the contumacy of that body arose partly from a wish to prolong the session for the sake of the pay, and commanded that this popular charge should be read in all the churches. In the same way they monopolized the not directly very lucrative honours of the Council; they accepted them, not as a pledge of submission to Government, but rather as an acknowledgment of their rank and power; very few of them were, their adversaries allow, Tories, *i. e.* supporters of prerogative. But the Council was the avenue to various lucrative posts, such as the Auditorship, endowed with an income of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of public money; the Treasurership, with 6 per cent. of all passing through that office; the Presidentship of the Council, and place of Attorney-General. And we find, accordingly, Dudley Digges, Randolph, Byrd, Robinson, and other aristocratic names perpetually associated with them.

It is not pleasant to discover that these gentlemen of high bearing, who have ever been renowned for so nice a sense of honour that even strangers find it rather a hard thing to avoid a suggestion of a recourse to pistols or bowie-knives, not content with distributing between their thousands of acres, and a farm of fifty, the charges for the support of administration, while they had themselves the lion's share in the expenditure,

were not ashamed to pillage the public secretly. The Speaker of the Assembly, who was also, by virtue of his office, Colonial Treasurer for the twenty-five years preceding 1765, was Robinson, the acknowledged head of the landed aristocracy, with a keen love of pomp and titles, but popular and courteous (that is, of course, to his equals). It was he who addressed the celebrated compliment to Washington, when utterly confounded, and incapable of uttering a single word in reply to the House of Burgesses' vote of thanks for his military services, after Braddock's defeat. Party management was his pride, and to get a vote he did not scruple to lend, on personal security, large sums of public money to these embarrassed trading squires. In the year 1765, however, this upright statesman felt a crisis was approaching. All his own private means were exhausted, and he had the impudence, backed by that of the tide-water oligarchs, to propose the establishment of a State Loan Office, with the intention of entering the old transactions as new ones. It was only by the eloquence of Patrick Henry, who, without impeaching the honesty of the powerful Speaker, excited the jealousy of the members from the upper counties, and laid up for himself a future tempest of hatred on the part of the aristocracy, that the iniquitous scheme was defeated. The next year Robinson died, irremediably insolvent, and, it was discovered, indebted to the Treasury 100,000 dollars.

These same were the men who, at least consistent in selfishness, lived in splendour, while they consoled their neighbours who in every creek starved on shell-fish, with the fact that they were not slaves of the Crown, and who, amidst professions of rigid orthodoxy, plundered the revenue of the Church. Far into the seventeenth century, only one chapel existed in Virginia. But their enthusiasm was only of a negative character; they had early got the right to induct transferred from the Crown to the vestries, which were formed by cooptation of the twelve leading men of the parish. They availed themselves of their power to keep the rectory in law vacant, letting church and parsonage fall into decay, while they allowed the officiating clergyman so humble a stipend, out of the very liberal provision made at the establishment of the Colony, that he was forced, in most cases, to eke it out by keeping a school. The Assembly itself sympathised with this policy, which had for its apparent object the curbing of any disagreeable disposition on the part of a minister to reprove his wealthy parishioners' morals, and, in fact, had guaranteed their charges to the defendants in the famous cause, when 'Patrick Henry plead against the parsons,' as the country still remembers.

Altogether no favourable impression is produced on the mind

by contemplating the social and political aspects of the tide-water districts. The planters were selfish, indolent, and rapacious. They did not even possess the idea of comfort. Their domestic architecture so offended Jefferson's ultra-classical taste, which took refuge in an admiration for Philadelphian neatness, that he exclaims, 'The genius of architecture seems to have shed its malediction over this land.' Its clumsiness, if indicative of wealth and comfort, would not rouse English instincts against it. But it only betrayed ostentation. It is in vain that we look in this, the old Virginia, for traces of rural ease and tastes. There we find no orchards or bright flower-gardens, no dairies or lawns; no neat farm-houses, as in New England. Every acre they had sufficient slave-labour to cultivate was used for the growth of tobacco, to supply the demands of rapacious English creditors. It was only by the law of entail, and the assistance they managed to obtain from the State Treasury, that they were maintained in their hereditary position. The former had been, very soon after the planting of the colony, imported from England, along with many other legal traditions, by the younger sons of families which had grown up under its shadow. Now such men accept colonial offices, or emigrate, but always with the distinct intention of spending a long residue of life in the neighbourhood of Pall Mall. Then, on a healthier principle, perhaps, they went to found a family which should flourish side by side, as it were, with the English stock. There were many Colonel Esmonds in those old times. Almost as a necessary consequence, they introduced entails, to ensure the transmission of their name and memory. At first, they could, as at home, be barred, and the property alienated; but by the end of the seventeenth century, it was discovered that the old cavalier spirit had become so rampant and triumphant as to have completely driven beyond the Chesapeake, into Maryland, and the North, the industry proper to a new country. Mortgages were in such headlong process of eating up the vast domains with which noble families had been endowed by the Crown, that it was apparent that, in a short time, the whole land would have passed into the hands, not of their more provident fellow Virginians, but of a small guild of merchants. These were in the habit, writes Jefferson to Lister Asquith, of accommodating their reckless host with loan upon loan, and then, 'having got him immersed in debt, they reduced the price given for his tobacco; so that, let his shipments be ever so great, and his demand of necessities ever so economical, they never permitted him to clear it off, the debts becoming hereditary from father to son for many generations, so that the planters were a species of property annexed to certain mercantile houses.' Even after the Revolution, the same

state of things existed, and Virginians, themselves by no means guiltless in this respect, lament it freely. The same statesman, whilst himself indulging, to the ruin of his private means and family respectability, in a love of the fine arts and of hospitality, writes regretfully from Paris, where he was ambassador, declaring that 'he looked back to the war as a time of happiness, when we could not run in debt, because nobody would trust us, when we practised, of necessity, the maxim of buying nothing but what we had money in our pockets to pay for,—a maxim which, of all others, lays the broadest foundation for happiness.' Under these circumstances, in the year 1705, the custom of docking entails, as it is called, that is, a way of restoring to the tenant the free control over the estate, was expressly prohibited, and thus the land bound up for ever with the family, unless the Legislature chose, as a favour to an individual possessor, to set it free. The effect was, that the careless prodigality of a planter's establishment was bounded only by his honesty, or personal credit, a very scanty security indeed for a creditor.

The contest initiated by Jefferson and Patrick Henry, for the abolition of the doctrine of entail with all its incidents, including, above all, this last, and also that of primogeniture, opened the eyes of the Virginian aristocracy to the nature of the struggle then commencing. In New England, the main object of the Revolution was to break the bond of dependence on the mother-country. In Virginia this was, indeed, one motive; but it was inseparably connected with another, and that was, as its own supporters phrased it, 'the substitution of an aristocracy of virtue and talent for the aristocracy of birth and wealth.' Few of the old aristocracy could be called Tories. Even adversaries, who hated the system, speak of 'only half-a-dozen aristocratic gentlemen, angry at the loss of their pre-eminence, venting their indignation at the change from a monarchy to a republic, and more worthy of pity than punishment.' But the main perplexity of the old families arose from the fact that they found the natural support of their own dignity to be the throne they had ever insulted, and could not now bring themselves to aid in re-establishing. This inconsistency was the weak point in their fortress. Men like the Randolphs had been Whigs, or more, for generations. They found themselves suddenly in the position of a Lord John Russell outbidden by a John Bright. They had resisted the Court, or Governor's party with a self approbation the most sincere. They had travelled to London, and intrigued in the purlieus of Whitehall for a century. All this had been in the interests of their own order. They were bitterly indignant at men who now demanded for

themselves a share in the glory of patriotism, and still more fiercely suspicious when they found them impertinently interfering in matters which concerned the disposition of the private property of their old chiefs. Such houses, which had long arrogated a monopoly of popularity, were the Randolphs, Flemings, Says, Eldridges, and Murrays, all of renown in the State, and in right of their descent from the fair Princess Pocahontas, princes of the blood royal of Virginia, as James I. intimated they should be accounted. They could point to portions of their estates as having once formed part of the royal demesne of that Indian emperor and puissant English baron, Powhatan. Another member of the coterie was the family of Digges, whose representative made it a point of pride always to receive George Washington, himself not averse, with all his modesty, to fine clothes and splendid equipages, on the broad bosom of the Potomac, in a barge of English make, rowed by six negroes in black velvet caps and checked shirts.

It is a redeeming trait in the history of the order, and one proof that it was not altogether vicious, that, when they found they must either abandon their old principles of political, and as they thought it, patriotic opposition, and desert to the side of the English Government, or else acquiesce in the destruction of many of their own cherished privileges, they did not choose the course of apparent expediency for a single moment. Further, though the whole system which they had instituted in Virginia had been doubtless bad, cumbrous, and effete, yet it is equally plain that, under it, the land reached, and for some time maintained, a pre-eminence, relatively to the rest of the New World, which it cannot now understand it has lost. It furnished a great revenue to the mother-country; it consumed a large quantity of its most elaborate and expensive products; it furnished it and the world at large with luxuries, which have been by general use almost converted into necessities. In the land itself there was a lavish display of wealth, not much comfort or good taste it is true, but, on the shores of glorious sea-floods rushing up far inland between majestic forests, a succession of noble villas, and wharves crowded with shipping. The aspect of the country was that of a Liverpool broken up, and spread up and down a hundred miles or so of estuary. To see that the country was eaten up with debt, and the prey of extravagance, it was necessary to wander farther, and examine more closely. We are told by a native Virginian (Professor Tucker), that Jefferson's laws have promoted the distribution of wealth, that 'a much larger number of those who are wealthy have acquired their wealth by their own talents or enterprise; and 'most of these last are commonly content with reaching the



'average of that more moderate standard of expense which public opinion requires, rather than the higher scale which it tolerates.' Again, that 'there were formerly many in Virginia who drove a coach-and-six, now such an equipage is never seen; that there were probably twice or three times as many four-horse carriages before the Revolution as there are at present; but the number of two-horse carriages may be now ten or even twenty times as great as at the former period;' that 'a few families could boast of more plate than can now be met with; but the whole quantity in the country has increased twenty if not fifty fold.' However this may be, it is certain that Virginia is now one of the worst conditioned and least flourishing members of the Union, though with a territory possessed of the most extraordinary natural advantages for trade, and that it was then far the foremost; that finally, it is with a sort of pitying contempt that the western and northern populations hear of demands made by their old chief for reverence which is only paid, if at all, to its history, and not to itself. At all events, an increase in national wealth, confessedly effected by adventitious capital from the north, can scarcely be adduced as evidence of the superiority of the new times to the old, when the south of the Chesapeake was celebrated exclusively for its civilization and luxury. The fact, that farmers from Maine and New Hampshire have raised the value of land on the Potomac from four dollars to forty or fifty, the price it fetched before the Revolution, rather induces a reflection on the superior prosperity of the times preceding, than those succeeding that event. The same sort of scepticism may be felt respecting the indignant denial by modern Virginians, of the disappearance of 'the class of Virginian gentlemen of chivalrous honour, and polished manners, at once high-minded, delicate, liberal, and munificent,' and the rejection of the proposition that, 'as to mental cultivation, our best educated men of the present day cannot compare with the Lees, the Randolphs, the Jeffersons, Pendletons, and Wythes of that period.'

That single State furnished the Union with four out of the first five Presidents, and a large proportion of the most eminent diplomatists and ministers, men who have in all parts of the European Commonwealth, as well as at home, stamped their character and theories of government on the policy and constitution of America. Certainly it may be doubted whether, at all events, the Virginian State-Assembly have, since the Revolution was a *fait accompli*, ever possessed so large a number as then of eminent orators and statesmen. There, when Patrick Henry first appeared in it, an uncouth country lawyer, with a

stolid abstracted air, and in his coarse hunting dress, startling the propriety of the glittering lobbies and committee-rooms of the Legislature, were to be seen Speaker Robinson, a very Sir John Trevor in powers of management and want of integrity, and Peyton Randolph, a noted intriguer, though Attorney-General, solid rather than eloquent, and well versed in parliamentary practice, two of those business men, heirs to an historic name, who can direct discreetly all men's affairs but their own. Another example of the non-rhetorical debater, and therefore a proof of the existence in the House of Burgesses of a set of men, not caught by fine declamation, but who took the trouble to consider a statesman's business powers, was Richard Bland, the *Virginian antiquary*, as he was called, learned and logical, but apt to retreat, startled, from the conclusions to which his own arguments had led his hearers. Edward Pendleton, the Conservative lawyer, with silver voice, and almost equal in skill in managing the House to his friend Robinson, and George Wythe, afterwards Chief Justice, the law tutor of Jefferson, a first-rate classic, but with an excessive love, it is said, for the Elizabethan writers (where shall we find such a failing in Congress?), and an amount of eccentricity which could scarcely be believed to be the possible possession of one man, were all banded together, originally on the Liberal-Conservative side. With them was Richard Henry Lee, one of the few members who, no lawyers, were perfectly masters of all the practice and forms; a Cicero in debate, 'and,' we are informed by an admirer of his, 'with a Cæsarean nose,' and a man who, though 'no Niagara, Homer, or Patrick Henry, flowed through banks 'covered with the bloom of spring.' We confess that it appears to us more than doubtful whether, though Virginia has probably recently developed the Niagara vein of eloquence which Mr. Wirt admires, it have produced so distinguished a set of men as these old Whig Oppositionists of the generation anterior to the Revolution. They manifested a peculiarly English tone of dexterous parliamentary tactics. They were men who might be ruining themselves, but who nevertheless had learnt thoroughly how to manage the details of business, and who did not talk for talking's sake. They were sure of their position. They had no particular reverence for public opinion, and there was nothing which they hoped to get from popularity. Their object was to maintain a reputation for good business abilities among their fellow-magistrates and lords-lieutenant. A future age, in the effervescence of a Revolutionary crisis, threw up tyrants of debate like Patrick Henry, men who, their panegyrists allow, when entrusted, by acclamation, with the task of drawing up a simple resolution, faltered, and at length elaborated

a thing which was at once, with as universal a consent, consigned to oblivion. They were the Addison of oratory, superseded by an under-clerk. The old Virginian statesmen seldom spoke on matters of grave public interest for longer than ten minutes at a time. They did not argue for victory, but simply to expound the opinion which they knew the rest would follow.

The Virginian politicians of the period of the Revolution in effect divide themselves under three great heads: the Conservatives, including few besides the Liberal-Conservatives (for the Tories were few at a period when the words *British Tory*, we are told, 'threw any company into a rage, and suggested tar and feathers'), the theoretical Democrats, men not from the people, and as sensitive of their personal rank as the aristocracy, from which, not wealth, but prejudices excluded them, but desirous to lead the people; and lastly, the real popular champions, such as Patrick Henry, men actually of, because from the masses, though from masses which themselves, in relation to a yet inferior body, constituted a highly privileged class. Of course, in the tide-water region, and more especially on the tropical banks of the James, thorough aristocrats might be found, of families which had never broken off their connexion with the English stock, men who often had been educated at Oxford or Cambridge, or fought a campaign in Flanders. They never, from first to last, pretended to popularity, and in many cases the heir had been sent to Europe on the first signs of the rising, and had there remained till the conclusion of peace. But the more influential of the party had always been Liberals as regarded the relations between the colony and mother-country, and Conservative only in respect to social relations and domestic policy. Of these, Washington, living towards the verge of the district, and with the more energetic and innovating Maryland stretching out in the distance, is a favourable, perhaps too favourable an example. He is their beau ideal, their apology, and in some measure the reflection of what this class once was. He is acknowledged by political adversaries to have possessed a judgment unsurpassed in soundness, better adapted to decide on the plans of others than to originate; to have been of an exact integrity and justice, and though naturally of an irritable temper, and a slave-owner, self-constrained and forbearing. He was liberal, but exact in his expenditure; not a fluent orator, and with little learning but reading, writing, arithmetic, and surveying, though he advocated all schemes for the promotion of education, and confessed to a great respect for Latin, and something of a mysterious reverence for Greek. He could dance, while a Republican commander-in-chief, three hours at

a time, and, when a Dictator, envy those whose rank did not scare partners. He, moreover, enjoyed the more serious reputation of being the best horseman of his time; and, though allied to English nobility, was the most practical of farmers, and a merchant, whose brand, 'George Washington, of Mt. Vernon,' passed a flour-barrel through the most suspicious West Indian custom-house.

Mount Vernon is in the district of the Potomac, now closed by the magnificent *façades* and marble terraces and balconies of Washington, before the river becomes the rocky romantic stream which it appears at its picturesque junction with the Shenandoah, at Harper's Ferry. This region, with its bold cliffs and wooded ridges, the waters beneath sparkling with countless shoals of herrings, carp, sturgeon, and bass, in their seasons, and darkened with armies of the canvas-back duck, was, in his time, the very heart of Virginian civilization. Now and then, a frigate would sail up from the broad Chesapeake, and, anchoring opposite the verandahs of a wealthy planter's mansion, pour forth a troop of officers and letters of introduction, to greet the squire who had, in many cases, as Lawrence Washington, himself served in the English navy. The river acted as a noble highway for gay barges to carry the planters and their wives to each other's houses, or to the festive little court of the Governor of Maryland, at Annapolis, with its balls, and dinners, and private theatricals. The shore line was studded with primitive but well-to-do farmhouses, such as the great General's birthplace, on Bridge's Creek, with its steep roof sloping into low projecting eaves, its single story, with the attic over, and great chimney at either end. It showed, too, and still does, many aristocratic edifices on the slopes above the water. Arlington, the house of Mr. Custis, Washington's step-grandson, with marble columns and porticoes, recalls the old days along with the new. Of a style of architecture not so classical, were Mount Vernon and hospitable Belvoir, built on the same ridge, the latter the residence of William Fairfax, Lawrence Washington's father-in-law, and just enough miles distant to provoke a ride and *réveillé* on a bright autumn morning. Many, we know, especially after the arrival of Lord Fairfax, were the hunting parties which met on the lawn of one or the other, to beat the wild woods, indented with rocks and rivulets, and natural deep dells, loved by fox and deer, to return to a hilarious hunting dinner, at which Washington seems to have had a capacity for being as merry as the most pleasure-loving of Diggeses or Randolphs. How proud he was of his stud, his truthful diary shows, where we read, set forth with something of gentle boastfulness, the

genealogies of 'Ajax,' and 'Magnolia,' and of keen fox-hounds, 'Music' and 'Sweet-lips' and 'Ringwood,' and a host of others, calling up pleasant reminiscences blended of 'Midsummer Night's Dream' and 'Dandie Dinmont.' Mrs. Washington, the blooming widow of the *Honourable* John Parke Custis, whom readers of Mr. Thackeray will remember, a lady, however, of birth and connexions not to be despised even by Madam Esmonds, and who had brought her second husband 100,000 dollars, had, on her part, her carriage and four, with black postilions in scarlet and white liveries, as brilliant as a high sheriff's suite, wherein to proceed in solemn state to the church of Porchich, or of Alexandria, of both of which the General was a vestryman, or, it might be, to one of those simple subscription balls at the latter town, which he, in his bachelor days, fastidiously and minutely describes as 'the bread-and-butter ball,' where 'the tea and coffee had a deep resemblance 'to hot water, and pocket-handkerchiefs were made, without 'apology, to serve the purpose of table-cloths.' He himself was not ashamed to deck himself in fine clothes, as when he travelled forth, to the admiration, doubtless, of the simple north-eastern cities, on a splendid horse, with mounted negroes behind him, to meet Governor Shirley, unpacking, probably, for the purpose, the 'fashionable gold-laced hat,' the 'drab-coloured riding frock with plain double-gilt buttons,' the 'superfine scarlet cloth waistcoat,' 'livery suits to be chosen by his 'London tailor by the Washington arms and housings, with the 'Washington crest,' and 'the very neat and fashionable New-market saddle-cloth,' of all which his account-books make particular mention.

His kitchen was thronged with servants, and his cellar well stocked with old wine. Beautiful gardens surrounded the house, this being an improvement peculiarly his own on the comfortless carelessness of tide-water proprietors about anything in the way of plants but tobacco, or ornamental copses but poplar-trees. He was ever trying to naturalize beautiful foreign trees; and profound were his meditations as to the superiority of one in point of shade to another. In his diary we find noted, under January 16th, that the whitethorn was in berry; on the 20th, he is busy clearing the pine-groves of the underwood, and, in February and March, transplanting ivy to adorn his garden-walls, and evergreens to make a cheerful winter prospect, or opening vistas through his woods, and twining scarlet honey-suckle round the columns of his verandah. We discover even sentiment in his improvements. He is careful to plant horse-chesnuds from his native county of Westmoreland (U.S.), sent him by his favourite, Harry Lee, the son of the 'Lowland

beauty,' a 'chaste and troublesome passion' for whom he had been, he tells us, forced (before the mature age of sixteen) 'to bury in the grave of oblivion.'

But, with all this love of finery and pretty shrubberies, he, and many others, though always a minority of the tide-water proprietors, was a plain, honest, country gentleman, pruning his own plantations, and, as his own game and water preserver (for a Virginian landowner no more tolerated a poacher than any English one), chastising, spite of bludgeons and guns, trespassers on his rights over canvas-back ducks and oyster-beds. He kept his own books, and, week by week, even with the cares, never neglected, of a struggling nation upon him, communicated to his agent, by means of carefully drawn maps, his views on the culture of each special field, mixing with economy benevolent orders to him, after the Sir Roger de Coverley school of country squires, to keep up hospitality in his master's place, and to 'let no one go hungry away.' He was indeed a most thorough practical farmer, not very skilful, he says of himself, but an enthusiast, not only procuring ornamental balsam-trees from New York, and vines from Languedoc, but ploughs from no less an agriculturist than Arthur Young, showing too his zeal by inventing one himself, and nearly ruining two of his best carriage-horses by putting them to drag it over the heavy sward. He rose before dawn, lit his own fire, though a slave-owner, and one whose every look was studied, out of love, and not of fear, by his troops of servants, and rode for four or five hours over his estate. The whole was most systematically divided by him into four different farms, each having its own allotment of labourers, and particular crops, and, with its woodlands, pastures, cornlands, eleven miles of fisheries, and villages stocked with tailors, shoemakers, smiths, and ware-housemen, constituting a fertile self-supporting principality of from three to four thousand acres. The result was, that he made agriculture pay, unlike most of his neighbours, whose estates were first eaten up by encumbrances, and, at length, after the new Constitution set them free from entails, sold to the overseers at the rate of about four dollars an acre, the master emigrating, with a portion of his slaves, far beyond the Blue Mountains. Washington's estate is now, sad to say, itself in the same, or nearly the same condition, the shrubberies overgrown, the lawn obliterated, and the whole, in short, in process of relapsing into a haunt for bears and wolves.

The Blue Ridge was then, as now, the land of hope, or, it might be, the forlorn hope of the broken-down landowners of the James or Potomac. A hundred miles away, amid the noxious exhalations of the marshy tide-water region, and over its black



foliage, those azure peaks can be seen floating in air. In early Virginian history we hear of powerful Indian emperors, of barbarous chieftains, whom the English colonist loved to terrify himself by styling kings, Powhatans and Oppecanoughs, whose sway was supreme throughout the hill-country. Round the base was a belt of land more fertile than the lowlands; but the native force was long too formidable, let alone the prejudice the planter had for placing his abode on an inlet of the sea, by which he could communicate directly with the mother-country, and the almost absolute necessity of such a position, before the making of good roads, for the disposal and carriage of his crops. By Charles a great grant of land in this direction was made to the Earl of St. Albans, Lord Berkeley, Sir William Martin and others, as proprietaries. Under their auspices, or in spite of them, the district gradually began to be settled, though the boundary of Virginia, till 1744, was still considered to be virtually that mountain range. A new grant was subsequently made, overriding the old one, of the royal right over the land between the Potomac and Rappahanock, called the Northern Neck, to Lord Culpepper, who had, says Oldmixon, 'trumped up a title to it,' and with very indefinite powers. It was in vain that the adventurers who had already occupied portions appealed to Charles (for Culpepper had shrewdly managed to get appeals in such cases transferred to the Crown from the Assembly, which had formerly cognisance of them). The answer was the obvious one, that, if they had encroached without a licence, they had done so at their own risk. They were forced eventually to compound with him for the payment of a quit-rent; Colonel Richard Lee, and Colonel Robert Carter, two of the chief Virginian magnates, members of the Council, and great freeholders on the Neck, consenting to act as his agents.

Thus the lands at the foot of the Blue Ridge became by degrees peopled, but, up to 1748, only a few Irish had made their way into the valley between it and North Mountain. Their 'repulsive manners,' we are told, over and above the bugbear of Indian forays, still interposed a barrier to any emigration thither from the alluvial country. But early in the reign of George II., Lord Fairfax was jilted for a duke by the belle of the day. Culpepper, whose favourite employment during his governorship seems to have been buying up light pieces of eight at five shillings, and then, by proclamation, raising their value to six, left no son to inherit this ill-gotten wealth. Fairfax was his grandson and heir through his mother; and, in his rage, this fashionable cornet in the Blues, who had studied Horace at Oxford, and written a paper in the '*Spectator*' (which Sparkes, with patriotic exaggeration, multiplies into *papers*), made his

succession to a Virginian proprietorship a pretext for quitting England. His cousin, the Honourable William Fairfax, a brave soldier, formerly Governor of New Providence, which he had helped to reduce, and Chief Justice of the Bahamas, had long resided on the Northern Neck as his agent. The peer was delighted with the taste for country sports he found existing on the Chesapeake. He went back, but only to get the old grant to his ancestor explained, so as to take in a great tract beyond the Alleghanies, and then returned for good to plant grounds, and teach the people fox-hunting.

This immense tract of rich waste land had never been surveyed; and Lord Fairfax found that numerous squatters were making their way up the stream, and securing an occupancy in the best plots without licence from him, or any thought of paying quit-rents, such things having been ever most abhorrent to an American's instincts. Washington, who was perpetually about Belvoir, had become an especial favourite of his, having developed a remarkable capacity for comprehending his lessons on sporting matters, though he himself disclaims the fame of an accomplished fox-hunter. He obtained a commission from him to survey the region, at a rate of salary which enabled him to earn a doubloon, or as much as six pistoles, a day. This district, between the Blue Ridge and the Alleghanies, is the third of the four zones into which geographers and politicians agree in dividing Virginia. It possesses the most temperate climate, and the most fertile soil. The hills, rarely rising to more than 2,000 feet, and presenting 'one continuous waving line, with intervening glens like gigantic wrinkles and furrows,' are covered so thickly with beech, cedars, and oak, red, white, and black, hung with roses and wild vines green in the midst of March, that surveyors are even now obliged to climb to the top of a tree to examine the country. The turf beneath is a complete garden. Rhododendrons, azaleas, the shumac, and *Kalmia* fringe the various-coloured cliffs which crop up beside the pathway; and, over all, are the blue summits melting away in the distance. The defect of the range is, that the ridge is not sufficiently broken; and there is a want of individuality about the several mountains. But it compensates for this deficiency in picturesqueness by its universal fertility. Even on the higher slopes are now found farms, chiefly on the Pennsylvanian frontier, cultivated by Germans, who have brought with them the experience, though, travellers say, scarcely the cleanliness, of civilization.

Beyond this beautiful Alpine region, Washington entered, in company with young George Fairfax, surveying, as he went along, a grand valley twenty-five miles broad, bounded by the Blue Mountains, with 'their soft liquid tints of mingled blue

and green,' on the one side, and North Mountain, a division of the Alleghanies, on the other; and irrigated throughout by the Shenandoah, 'daughter of the stars,' as the Indian tribes called it for its beauty. This great central valley of Virginia is now the chief pride of the State. It is often called 'Virginia' simply. It is a great wheat and Indian corn growing country; and the slopes of every hill are painted with sunny-looking peaches and apples. Its social aspects are said to be intermediate between those of the birthplace of 'sweet-scented' tobacco, which had even then shifted to the east of the mountains, and of the maize and cotton plantations of the lower tide-water country, on the one hand, and those of the Northern States on the other. The number of slaves is smaller than in the former, and labour, which is also much more agreeable there to the physical constitution of the white man, does not involve a loss of caste. The estates, too, are generally for the same reason more moderate in extent. The tone of comfort is greater; and farmers do not, as farther south, live from year to year on pork, salt fish, or corn bread; but make the soil yield fruit and garden vegetables. Many are to be found of the class described by Jefferson—'I know no condition happier than that of a Virginian farmer might be. His estate supplies a good table, clothes himself and his family with their ordinary apparel, furnishes a small surplus to buy salt, sugar, coffee, and a little finery for his wife and daughters, enables him to receive and visit his friends, and furnishes him with a pleasing and healthy occupation.' Nevertheless, there are also many estates in this delicious valley on a far ampler scale, large enough to afford their owners leisure for studying politics and refinement, and to provide a surplus for the exercise of the munificent hospitality which delights a southern planter. Some domains, as probably the lands of the house of Fairfax, are even princely.

The country now, with its baths, and springs of sulphur, salt, red, and white, first made fashionable by Washington himself, who purchased the site of one of the principal, crowded as Saratoga, and expensive as Pau or Biarritz, would amaze Solomon Hedge, Esquire, his Majesty's Justice of the Peace, to whose supper party the young explorer, and the rest of the company, brought their own knives, and did without forks. The latter was in ecstasies with the valley, its beauty and its richness, its oaks, and sugar-maples; and Lord Fairfax was so fired by his report, that within a short time he moved from his cousin's house at Belvoir, across the Blue Ridge, with horses and dogs, books, retainers, and coats of arms. He laid out a noble manor of ten thousand acres, with pastures, woodland, and cornland, to be entitled, with the stately manor-house he

designed to build upon it, Greenway Court. For the present, he took up his residence in his steward's 'quarter,' a long stone house on a green knoll overlooking the Shenandoah, one story high, with dormer windows, and two wooden belfries, a roof with low eaves, and a long verandah the whole length of the house for summer evening sauntering. About the knoll were outhouses for servants, stables, and kennels, and a hut twelve feet square, in which it pleased the master, from some pet eccentricity, to sleep, away from the main building. In the library, Washington, a constant guest, loved to read English history, and the 'Spectator,' often, we may be sure, talking to the old lord of his particular contribution thereto.

The gaunt old man, with his near sight, light grey eyes, and sharp features, and generally strange appearance and manifold oddities, soon won the hearts of his neighbours. He acted, with the greatest ardour, the part of road-surveyor, and, in the character of lord-lieutenant of the county, was in the habit of feasting, during the assizes at Cumberland, all the notables of the vicinity. At one time he would be drilling a militia cavalry troop on his lawn; at another, when game was scarce at Greenway Court and Belvoir, he migrated *en masse* to some rustic inn, in the heart of a wild forest, and there made all who could join his hunting party his guests for weeks at a time. When the Indian tribes were in arms all about him, at the time of Braddock's fatal expedition, he disdained to remove to the lower country, and, with his negroes and half-breed huntsmen and friends, beat the woods as before. The Revolution was a heavy grief to him. No one ever dreamt of molesting the old man, though he did not care to disguise his royalism; but the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown to his old friend and *protégé*, is said to have killed him, if it is necessary to look for any special reason for the death of a man of ninety-two. Thus pathetically does a local poet sing that catastrophe, after a prose prelude how that he called to his valet, 'Come, Joe, carry me to bed; for it is high time for me to die.'

'Then up rose Joe, all at the word,  
And took his master's arm.  
And thus to bed he slowly led  
The lord of Greenway Farm.

'Then oft he called on Britain's name,  
And oft he wept full sore,  
Then sighed, "Thy will, O Lord, be done,"  
And word spake never more.'

WEEM'S *History of Mount Vernon*.

To this new country, opened up by Washington, and emancipated, by the residence in it of so great a glory to Virginia

as an English baron, from the ill name, which, as we have mentioned, the infesting of it by Irish may have given it, soon thronged crowds of adventurers. Thither came, in 1772, Horatio Gates, godson and reputed son of Horace Walpole, once well known in fashionable London coteries, and who had long before achieved in America a brilliant military fame. He was now, at the age of forty-six, a disappointed half-pay officer, somewhat corpulent and *passé*, and, we are told, 'with a disagreeable proneness to wheedle,' got by haunting antechambers and Pall Mall. He bought an estate beyond the Blue Ridge, in Berkeley County, called the 'Traveller's Rest,' a name suggesting a pre-existence in the shape of a roadside inn; and then he looked round to see how he could best turn the circumstances of this troubled period to account. About the same time, his friend Lee, major-general to the King of Poland, and aide-de-camp to his Majesty of Portugal, besides holding various other honorary offices, was, among other birds of prey, who seem to have scented the war from afar, wandering about America. His journey ostensibly was undertaken to make good some claim he had upon Government to a grant in the South; but he had already been strongly suspected of tampering with the New England patriots. Gates wrote eagerly to him, expatiating on the advantages of a neighbouring farm, then for sale, with a flour-mill, and 2,400 acres, sure in ten years, he affirmed, to have doubled their value. In the meantime, he offers him 'a good bed, and two or three slaves, at the "Traveller's Rest," 'to wait on his whimsies' (one of these whimsies, and one, too, peculiarly disagreeable to neat Mrs. Washington, we learn, being a habit of taking troops of dogs about with him to friends' houses, and even insisting on having them accommodated with seats at the dinner-table). We suppose, from Gates's own allusions, that his farmhouse was moderately comfortable; but General Lee's, on the Shenandoah, was a mere shell, the different (proposed) apartments being indicated only by lines chalked on the ground. It was at least, he would argue, economical; he could, from any part, without the least inconvenience, overlook the entire establishment, enjoying the luxuries of library, bed-room, harness-room, and kitchen, without stirring a foot. It was to this primitive abode that this tattered soldier of fortune, suspected, neglected, and virulent, retired about the middle of the war, to abuse his 'Small Friends,' and, with a sneer at Washington, declare his belief that 'hoeing tobacco must be the best school to form a consummate general.'

Washington himself, although he had done so much, in youth and age, to make the region known, and had even sagaciously bought some very fertile portions of it, cannot be considered a

representative of its planters. He is the ideal of what the old tide-water planter might have been, with the fine equipages, and manners, and prerogative of a feudal lord of a manor, but the spirit and industry of a merchant of Amsterdam. Other proprietors in the 'great valley,' *grands seigneurs* as Lord Fairfax, and sojourners as Lee and Gates, were never American in their habits of thought and feeling. President Jefferson, though not locally belonging actually to the Shenandoah, is a good representative of the intermediate state of society which flourishes on its banks. He had large possessions, both at Poplar Forest, in Bedford County, and at Monticello, close to the town of Charlottesville. Some of the wonders of the district were close to his own lands; the natural bridge was even his property. He always considered himself a natural enemy of the tide-water aristocracy. Washington, in common with the latter class, doubted the future of a republic; but Jefferson believed in it most implicitly, and was a democrat as to social, as well as a republican as to foreign relations. By fortune he belonged to the higher ranks, having, in the rich hollows of the Blue Ridge Highlands, an estate of from five to six thousand acres, and at Poplar Forest a great tobacco-plantation, with flour-mills, canals, and locks, leading from the Rivanna, constructed at a cost of thirty thousand dollars. He was, too, a great slave-owner, possessing about a couple of hundred, though in his 'Notes on Virginia' he denounces the system, and sublimely exclaims, 'The only firm basis of national liberty is the conviction that liberty is the gift of God.'

So far as theory went, Jefferson was consistent enough. But his assertion of the right of all to equal privileges, and outcry against presidential titles, and levées, and tables of precedence, were combined with the prejudices and habits of a Virginian gentleman. He was especially jealous of any assumption of a right to intrude upon his privacy, upon the ground of his public character, or to criticise his private conduct. The visitor who introduced himself with the remark that 'he had availed himself of a common privilege of calling upon him,' was met with a far more chilling rebuff than Scott's American persecutors at Abbotsford. In the same tone he complains to his brother-ex-president Adams of the multitude of letters with which his leisure was fretted and worried. 'Is this life? It is the life of a mill-stone. To such a life that of a cabbage would be paradise.' Neither was his general mode of life in the least democratic, in the ordinary sense of the term. The care of his Poplar Forest estate he left wholly to an overseer, a course fatal, he himself acknowledges, to the profits of a southern plantation. He declares, indeed, that 'from breakfast to dinner, he was always in his



'shops, his garden, or on horseback among his farms;' and that 'he talked with his neighbours of ploughs and harrows, seeding and harvesting,' affecting, moreover, great interest, while abroad, in the probable returns from his 'little essay in red clover;' but it seems exceedingly probable that a nursery of young politicians he kept down in the neighbouring village of Charlottesville, directing their studies, and conversing frequently with them on subjects of politics, was the object of many of these rides. Or perhaps he was composing Greek epitaphs, or criticizing Plato, whom, we are shocked to find, he had the want of taste to decry as 'full of puerilities and unintelligible jargon.' He had a fondness, too, for fine horses, spending, for instance, at one time, a couple of thousand dollars on the purchase of four, and a polite taste for French cookery, to the indignation of Patrick Henry, who called it 'treason against one's native victuals.' Every stranger who brought to Monticello letters of introduction, was invited to stay. He was never without occasional guests, entertaining his neighbours from Marrowbone, Horse Pasture, and Poison Field, and other localities which his letters have made classical, and all, of whatever phase of politics, with the same courtesy. Even those federal Tories of Bedford County, who, he knew, detested his doctrines, as he did theirs, were there; and musical prisoners of war from Burgoyne's staff, for whose stay in Albemarle he pleaded successfully with the Legislature, on the ground of their having planted gardens, and collected for themselves poultry, were no less heartily welcomed than their predecessor at Collé, the Italian Mazzei, whose vineyards they treated as ruthlessly as did Czar Peter Evelyn's holly hedge at Say's Court. An incessant flood of visitors was contributed from the neighbouring University of Virginia, built among the woods on the same skirts of the Blue Ridge as Monticello, under his immediate supervision, after a quasi classical model, and with a course of studies from which were *not* excluded those Latin and Greek classics, which, in his first burst of zeal for experimental philosophy, he abuses, in the description of William and Mary's College, in his 'Notes,' as 'disgusting and degrading' to those magnificent 'young gentlemen already prepared for entering on the sciences.'

Besides his schemes for reforming education, he believed that he had a vocation for amending the architecture of his native State; and the four parallel ranges of this neighbouring university, with the glittering dome of its rotunda, are monuments of his views on the subject. His own house was a favourable instance of gentlemen's houses on the outskirts of the Blue Ridge. It commanded a glorious view to the east, over an undulating forest plain, with the mountains seen stretching away

to the distance of a hundred miles. Aboriginal forest-trees surrounded it on three sides, the fourth being occupied by a large hanging garden. Of course, the mansion had a Grecian portico and cupola, and raised terraces. Saloons, and hall, and drawing-rooms were crowded with curiosities, moose and elk, Indian weapons and Italian statuary, and the library well stored with books, and mathematical and philosophical instruments (indeed, on journeys, he was in the habit of taking with him, somewhat after the fashion of Dr. Johnson, a set of logarithm tables); while walls and floors were adorned with paintings, and mosaic work by his slaves.

Unhappily, in addition to various elegant tastes, this really great politician had all a southern planter's instinct of living beyond his income. Even his presidential salary of 25,000 dollars, *i. e.* about five thousand guineas, a year, did not prevent his quitting office, at the end of eight years, ten thousand dollars out of pocket. His estate gradually dwindled away. Bad crops were looked upon as mere accidents, which would not recur, and plots of land sold to defray the loss; while a good harvest was treated as a windfall, and not taxed to supply the defect of the previous autumn. His labourers, who should have been at the plough, were engaged meantime on works of art. The result of all this was, that the statesman who had, in and out of office, vehemently discouraged lotteries, was persuaded finally, in his necessity, to ask as a charity from the Assembly of the State the right to institute one, for the more profitable sale of his plantation. It is impossible to avoid being amused, this being the ex-president's own financial condition, at the argument which he uses to induce Short, Munroe, and Madison, the two latter subsequently presidents, to fix their residence near; urging their migration on the ground not merely of the opportunity of social intercourse, but of the example of economy they might show the whole country side. Albemarle County was not allowed to watch these economists in direct collocation. Only Munroe went so far as to build a house in the mountains; but he was soon called away to pursuits in which he made altogether, from first to last, 400,000 dollars, yet died insolvent; truly a proper person to be advised by Jefferson to solicit his friends for an office of from 800 to 1,000 dollars' salary! Nevertheless, there was a clear difference between the extravagance of these statesmen of the Blue Ridge, and that of the tide-water proprietors. Both classes had an equal tendency to insolvency; but in the extravagance of the latter there was a method, which made their difficulties a greater reproach to themselves. Deliberately they lived beyond their incomes for the love of state and show, or from absolute indolence and recklessness. The former class,

such as Jefferson and Munroe, found their resources gradually wasting away, they did not know how. They had forgotten, in their own cases, though they were always reminding others and each other of the secret, that a Virginian planter must, to keep solvent, ever think of himself as a merchant and farmer; not as an English landlord, whose only care is to collect his rents. Their excuse, though not a perfectly satisfactory one, was that, had they preserved their fortunes, they could not, probably, have devoted themselves, as they did, to the business of the State.

Virginia, besides its rich proprietors, whether tide-water oligarchs, Shenandoah farmers, or theorists and statesmen, in the villas of the Blue Ridge, had, and still has, its class of yeomen, composed indiscriminately of the old colonists, more recent emigrants, and emancipated bondsmen. According to the constitution of the settlement, it was intended that the chief part of the land should belong to this order of men, it being contemplated by the original scheme, as in that of New England, that only a few men of distinguished rank or wealth, and likely to give a tone to the province, or if necessary to defend its rights at home, were to be allured into residing, by grants of large domains. But this original plan had been subverted by the avarice of governors and surveyors-general, who gave to any single individual, who had sufficient wealth or influence over them, many lots of fifty acres, or by the fraud, connived at by the officials, of ship captains, who obtained in different counties different independent allotments, in virtue of the same voyage. Such yeomen as there were, with, it is true, an inferior degree of energy, resulting from the difference of climate, do not seem to have been in kind different from the farmers of the north-east. They made no pretence to grandeur. They did not ride the magnificent horses found by Cornwallis in Virginian stables, and which La Fayette styles 'racers.' Their steeds were like dogs, and they dwelt in log huts. The oppression of the upper classes, who lent them goods and money at enormous interest, gradually, however, spoilt their better qualities, and they certainly do not form a very prepossessing feature in the general history of Virginia, with their high temper and slovenly lazy ways, indulging in the fashionable pursuits of hunting and racing, and mortgaging, along with their rich neighbours. However, to this class belonged Patrick Henry, and he was not ashamed of it, though his biographer, Mr. Wirt, describes him grandly, as born at the family seat of Audley, and son of no less a personage than Colonel Henry, who also occasionally acted as a county magistrate. With them he certainly ate, drank, and talked, dressing in their rough costume, and even, when now famous, using much of their accent.

At one time, he managed a store. When this failed, with more of the spirit supposed to mark a Yankee than a Virginian, he betook himself to practising in the county courts, in one of which his own father presided, though occasionally officiating as his father-in-law, Skelton's, substitute, at a bar of a different kind, kept at Hanover Court-house. Hunting and dancing still occupied much of his attention; and his first meeting with a future coadjutor, Jefferson, was at a ball given by Colonel Dandridge, while on ordinary occasions he would rush in to conduct a case, fresh from the chase, in a slouched hat and tattered clothes. A New Englander of the middle class is consistent in his ways; he dresses for his common business in good broadcloth, he does not change it for extraordinary occasions. Patrick Henry is a type of a far less regular and orderly set of men. At the bar of the general court we find him arranged in a full suit of black velvet, and an elaborately powdered tie wig. On his election into the House of Burgesses, he had advanced to a peach-coloured coat, after the fashion of Goldsmith; and on taking his place as governor of his native State, and migrating with his household into a palace (thus the governor's mansion was styled), he blazed forth in a trailing scarlet robe, and other Roman-senator-like magnificences; all which furnished copious matter for sneers to the young gentlemen fresh from European courts, who were wont to profess that they could not think it of great importance, 'whether a country 'were ruled by a despot with a tiara on his head, or by a demagogue with a red cloak and caul-bare wig.'

The great merit of him and his class was their fulness of life and energy. The Randolphs and Robinsons, when they laid down an office, retired to the superior dignity and influence of country gentlemen, surrounded by troops of admiring friends and dependents. Henry, on the contrary, and his class had, on retiring, to resume their practice or other business. He, for instance, betook himself to the drudgery of the petty district courts of Prince Edward County and New London. But these men, at all events, succeeded in effecting what was altogether beyond the reach of the great old families, viz. the realization of fortunes. It was only after a double manhood of labour, as it were, that he retired to live out an honoured old age, and the evenings of many summers, under the shade of a huge walnut-tree in which he most delighted.

He ever acknowledged himself, and was acknowledged by his old equals, to be from and of them, and their representative throughout. It can hardly be but that they possess a capacity for the qualities which he developed so fully. Now, the Virginian Capes are no longer a by-word in Bristol, Liverpool,

and the London Exchange. Trade, and wealth, and political power have drifted round the Alleghanies, north-east and south-west, and its marine is exceeded by that of so small a State as Maine. The Old Dominion, which once esteemed the Presidentship all but its inalienable right, has gradually sunk below Ohio, and holds but the fourth place in the representation in Congress. Even its progress, where any, is due to strangers, not to its own people. Farmers from Maine locate themselves on the rich shores of the Potomac, and gather in abundant harvests from land which overseers had reported to be thoroughly exhausted; and companies from England, Old and New, are working mines, the very existence of which was unknown to the native Virginians, and giving the latter hire for doing what they would have never consented to undertake on their own account. All this Virginia has richly deserved. Few countries have enjoyed greater advantages, or had a fairer start into prosperity, or more misused them all. Its hope of rising again, if the blight of slavery can be removed, must be found, not in the old lineage still vegetating on the river estuaries, or in the accident of a party of clever, dexterous statesmen, choosing for their retreat the Shenandoah, or belt at the foot of the Blue Ridge, but in the old race of yeomen who still do exist, in whatever part of the State, and of whatever origin,—whether descended from fellow-voyagers of Sir Walter Raleigh, or from convicts sold for a few pounds of coarse tobacco.

---

- ART. III.—1. *London Union on Church Matters. Annual Report, 1858.*  
 2. *Society for the Revival of Convocation. Annual Report, 1858.*  
 3. *Ecclesiological Society. Annual Report, 1859.*

WE remember having been greatly struck by an observation which we read, many years since, in some article or pamphlet, in which the writer says, that if he were asked what he believed would be the future of the Church movement, he would reply, that in his opinion it would, as years went on, make less apparent, but more real, progress. We fear that this author was among those who at an early date struck their flag to the Vatican. But the value of all prophecy is independent of the personal life of the prophet; and in this instance circumstances have singularly concurred to confirm the prediction.

Now that we have arrived at the commencement of a fresh decade, we may reasonably use the experience of 1860 to look back upon the fortunes of a movement which commenced twenty-seven years since, if dated from the first publication of the 'Tracts for the Times,' and thirty-three if we refer the Church revival to the appearance of the 'Christian Year.' This movement, or revival, has in the meanwhile passed through several phases and numberless vicissitudes. It has oftentimes been utterly extinguished, if we are to believe the assurances of the newspapers any year for the last quarter of a century; and time after time, during the same period, the fathers, brothers, and husbands of England have been spasmodically exhorted to resist the heresy whose insidious progress threatened to invade the sanctity of every hearth. What is of more consequence, the souls of those to whom the revival of Apostolic Christianity and of the Church of the English Prayer-Book was the most sacred and the most strong incentive to active exertion, must have frequently bounded with joy at some great and unexpected success, or sunk at some sad and apparently undeserved blow. But still the movement has gone on. It has not leavened the whole English Church, neither has it fallen from within or without. The whole force, material, moral, and intellectual, of the opposite interest—the Low Church, or so-called Evangelical party—has been arrayed against it, and it has held its own. The political and sectarian foes of the Establishment have thought to make good their attacks by railing at the 'Tractarianism' existing within its limits, and yet the Establishment, Tractarian or not, still exists in honour



and pre-eminence. The Church of Rome now reckons among its most ardent votaries several of those who were early and forward in the English revival, and yet that revival confronts their present assault with the weapons which they themselves had helped to forge. What, however, will be the end of all this? Thirty years is a short time for a cause which is destined ultimately to triumph, to make good its footing upon the hard and slippery soil of public opinion. Thirty years, again, is not a long space for the temporary and fluctuating success of an agitation, to which its bitterest antagonists are compelled to attribute the worldly merits of ability and earnestness in its votaries, the poetry of tradition and ceremonialism, and the practical recommendations of a symmetrical and authoritative system. Is that Church movement, then, which is now energising in a second generation, at the beginning of its end, or at the end of its beginning? We have, for our own part, no hesitation in saying, that we believe the latter to be the case; but while we make the assertion, we desire as explicitly to say that we do not for a moment anticipate a run of unchequered success, as the normal condition of sound Churchmanship in that generation. We must, moreover, add that many of the difficulties with which its course has been hampered were of its own seeking, and have arisen from the defective policy of Churchmen themselves, not less than from the defections to Rome, or the unmitigated hostility of that Puritanism which exists both outside and within the Church of England. The *Church cause* (a term which we shall employ for the remainder of this article in preference to 'movement' or 'revival') is, we believe, both holding and gaining ground, although the Church school is stationary, and the Church 'party' for the present unfortunately absent on furlough. To explain our phraseology, we must observe that for the few earliest years of the movement the advocacy of Church principles rested in the hands of a school, in the academic sense of the term. During another term that school had grown into a party, and still more lately the party has retired into the background. In other terms, we have first to deal with a cause and a school, next with a cause and a party, and finally with a cause.

We shall not take up the history of the revival while it continued to be merely a cause and a school. The growth of genuine Church principles for the few first years after No. 1 of the Tracts for the Times had appeared was solid and extensive, although it encountered opposition not only from Puritan and Latitudinarian, but from that too often timid and unenergetic residuum of the ancient High Churchmanship which called itself the old orthodox party, and was designated by the 'new' school by the less

complimentary cognomen of 'high-and-dry.' During its 'school' days, the attention of Churchmen of the modern stamp was directed to doctrinal rather than to administrative quasi-political or ritualistic questions, although the movement had its rise in the political shocks which the Church received through the suppression of the ten Irish sees, and the threatened attacks on the Prayer-Book and on the English Establishment, by which the first reformed Parliament carried popularity.

The process by which the famous address of heads of families to William IV. in favour of the integrity of the Established Church grew in the hands of a few eminent Oxford men into a proclamation more bold than our generation are accustomed to hear, of the essential characteristics of a Church in its theological sense, was really short and simple. The immediate result was that as the perils of the Establishment seemed to diminish, the movement apparently collapsed, and continued for some time to have its centre in the common room and college library. The earliest occasion on which anything like a Church party under the influence of the Oxford school appeared on the scene was on the occasion of the first of the two public demonstrations against the successive preferments of one who, after having twice rallied the strength of orthodox Churchmanship against himself, has singularly subsided into a peaceable prelate, remarkable if for anything for a quiet but friendly encouragement of the Church cause in his diocese. Need we name Dr. Hampden? In the successful proceedings taken against him by the general body of Oxford graduates, on his appointment in 1836 to the Regius Chair of Divinity, were combined Churchmen of the new school, the old orthodox, and the zealous Evangelicals, Mr. Vaughan Thomas being joined with Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey in the conduct of the case; and the significance of the event was probably not lost on the sensible minister to whom the Episcopal bench owed a Denison, a Longley, and a Thirlwall. We remember hearing not long after, when very young, an enthusiastic Oxford Churchman descanting on the probability of Mr. Newman being the next Lady Margaret Professor, owing to the sympathy between his then views and those of the majority of country clergymen, graduates in divinity, whom this event had brought up. These graduates came to Oxford and dispersed again, and the Church party was still in an inchoate state, although it had succeeded in the first great requisite for a party—the selection of its leaders. We need not say who the three 'illustrations' of Oxford were whom the universal voice of Churchman designated to that post. Another man, H. J. Rose, who had at an earlier date upraised the voice of Churchmanship at Cambridge, was too

soon lost to the world and to the Church. The creation about this time of the Metropolis Churches Fund evoked liberality for a specific religious end such as had too long been strange to our Church.

We pass over five years, and take our stand at the eventful epoch of Sir Robert Peel's second administration. The Church party had then grown into something like shape and consistency, and its numbers were constantly being recruited from the younger generation. It had succeeded in arresting the attention, often the respect, never the contempt, though not unfrequently the dislike, of the organs of public opinion. It wanted some things which a party ought to have possessed; there was no central organization for the interchange of thought and counsel, neither was there any newspaper advocating Church opinions, although it had a monthly organ in the *British Magazine* as originally conducted; and the *British Critic*, long the quarterly organ of the old High Churchmen, had at a later date passed into the hands of the new school, and was for some time edited by Mr. Newman himself. But the list of the well-known and trusted leaders at Oxford was still unbroken. Dr. Mill had returned to England, and had assumed a leading position at Cambridge, in which University, under the auspices of the Camden, now Ecclesiological, Society, that systematic development of the decencies of worship, and the charms of religious art, had been inaugurated, which has since extended so far and thriven so vigorously. Dr. Hook, at Leeds, exercised an enormous influence. Mr. Gladstone, who had already published his elaborate treatise on Church and State, was called into the new Government, though not at first into the Cabinet, and was justly regarded as the lay leader of the Church 'party,' a party which received several accessions of Parliamentary strength at the dissolution of 1841. With a 'Conservative' Government in, Churchmen seemed to breathe again, although Sir Robert Peel had been the author of the Ecclesiastical Commission during his previous administration. Still there were elements of danger lurking under this seeming prosperity. The error of judgment had been committed, of publishing, among Mr. R. H. Froude's Remains, crude and confidential fragments of the private letters and journals of a man, really too young, with all his ability, to be raised to the position of a theological teacher and leader, and the enemies of the Church cause had made the worst of the matter. But a more serious peril impended. Dr. Wiseman's two articles upon the Donatists had two years previously appeared in the *Dublin Review*; and though the fact was kept a long time concealed from the general public, his shaft had struck the noblest quarry, and had disturbed the

mind of that man whose brilliant abilities had long raised him to the unquestioned intellectual leadership of the revival, of which he was one of the earliest promoters, as well as the foremost antagonist of the Church of Rome.

*Hoc fonte derivata clades.* Of all the theological chiefs of the Church cause, Mr. Newman was emphatically the *ἀνὴρ πολιτικός*—he was the one teacher endowed with the instinct of putting secular powers in motion in connexion with scholastic guiding. Without this instinct the deepest learning, the simplest and most guileless life are deficient in the qualities peculiarly essential to the conduct of a party. It is accordingly almost impossible to express how detrimental to the cause was the misfortune of a leader, so specially endowed, being, as it were, stricken in mid course, while in the enjoyment of the confidence of a party powerful and energetic, but in a great degree young, enthusiastic, and unversed in the ways of the world. An attitude more trying for the person himself we cannot conceive, and we are accordingly most anxious to say nothing which should seem to impute moral blame to that great, though mistaken man, Mr. Newman. No evidence has transpired to show that his feelings at first were more than those of anxious and unsatisfied doubt. To have published such doubts, and to have retired from his position, would have been to have inflicted the gravest possible blow on the cause which he still might have been able to lead, with a heart and mind relieved from any misgivings. Still the difficulty on the other side was as great in deciding how far it was right even to profess to sound the trumpet, with the risk that the sound might be uncertain.<sup>1</sup> Without dissecting feelings more minutely, we may venture to say that from the day that his misgivings gained the mastery over his mind, Mr. Newman's practical usefulness as the leader of the 'new' Church party had come to an end. The effects of his disorganizing influence soon made themselves felt. The tone of the *British Critic*, able as ever, became suspiciously acrid. The gallant plunge which Mr. Oakeley had made in London, into a hearty, though somewhat uninstructed manifestation of Church worship, according to the rule of the Christian seasons and the spirit of the Prayer-Book, was gradually sicklied over with an unhealthy hue of clique. Matters, to be sure, had been previously brought to a head by Tract 90, and the war of pamphlets which it created; and Mr. Newman, under an episcopal censure, most considerately administered, retired, to settle down at Littlemore into what we fully believe he intended, at the time, should be a condition of meditation, if not of isolation,

---

<sup>1</sup> The text 'If the Trumpet,' &c. was the motto of the 'Tracts for the Times.'

but which, under the sharp provocation of the subsequent 'Jerusalem Bishopric' scheme, and owing to his restless energy, soon grew into a college within colleges, a school within a school, a party within a party, zealous, learned, and self-denying, to the extent of asceticism, but still alien from the general tone of the English Church, and following its own path, however divergent from the broad way of the Church cause.

The formidable and powerful opposition to the movement, which had heretofore sparred in the air, then found aim enough and to spare for the most scientific prize-fighting. The painful episode of Dr. Pusey's condemnation to a lengthened silence from preaching at Oxford, by the Six Doctors, in consequence of his sermon on the Eucharist, preached in May, 1843, occurred about this time. This event caused great excitement, and deep indignation was felt for the sufferer; but the period expired, and the learned and saintly orator returned to the University pulpit, steadfast, as before, in the Church of England. Mr. Macmullen's persecution, which occurred about the same time, also helped to keep up the spirits of Churchmen to indignation pitch.

We do not insist on the unfortunate stone-altar case. It was a great mistake not to have carried it to the Judicial Committee; but this discomfiture did not exercise any marked or general influence. The cause still thrived, and the party grew, although the voice of S. Mary's preacher was hushed. Clergyman after clergyman saw that there was something in it, and acted on the perception. Squire after squire began restoring or building his church in a fashion which would have made his father's hair stand on end. Gentle and simple, men and women, took to frequent communions, and to attending services, weekday and holyday, in a way which ten years sooner would have perplexed the most apathetic neighbourhood. The old Church societies saw their coffers overflowing as they had never done before; and the newer experiments, such as the Additional Curates' Society, gained a solid footing. Bishops charged upon the Church revival, some with considerable though variously accentuated favour, a few with a bitterness which showed how severely the unhealthy cuticle of Puritanism had been galled. Conspicuous by ready talents and influential position, Bishop Blomfield had delivered that charge in 1842, which almost placed him in the position of leading the Church party. To be sure, the results of the surplice row, which began at Exeter, and, spreading to a Berkshire parish, led to the *Times's* tergiversation, went far to neutralize the immediate effect of that *pronunciamento*, but yet it left its permanent mark behind. Besides, the Bishop himself abandoned his own counsels at the dictation of the Islington clergy, an event which of

course created a position more or less uncomfortable between him and those of his clergy who had complied with his injunctions, the effects of which were long felt, while those who had defied his authority were enabled to, and did make use of, the advantage which they had thus gained. But elsewhere the cause prospered; and above all things, the glorious and successful movement in favour of an extended colonial episcopate, which commenced on the election of Mr. Selwyn for New Zealand, which was followed up by the systematic organization of the Colonial Bishops' Fund, and was crowned by Miss Coutts' munificence, went far to prove the cause triumphant. Still the Church party did not manage its opportunities as well as it might have done. Mr. Newman's course had, as we have seen, deprived it of its politico-theological leader. Publicly it manifested a feeling of suspicion towards politicians, which savoured somewhat of the cloister. Undoubtedly Sir Robert Peel had no love for the 'new' school. It was not wonderful that a man, sensitive almost to morbidness, could not have cherished much affection for a movement, symbolized, in his eyes, by that 'Catholicus,' the pseudonym of the redoubtable Newman, to whom the *Times*, in its passing fit of uncompromising Churchmanship, had opened its columns for a series of letters, keenly turning to ridicule the statesman's elaborated discourse on his inauguration as Lord Rector of Glasgow. But for all that, Sir Robert Peel had even less love for Exeter Hall; and the minister whose bishops, presented or translated, were Lonsdale, Gilbert, Bagot, Wilberforce, and Turton, was one whom the Church party, instructed by subsequent events, would have treated more civilly than it cared to do during the days of his power, in spite of the Jerusalem blunder. The abortive Education Bill of Sir James Graham gave the Church privileges such as no minister has since ventured to offer; it was, however, rejected, but its rejection led to a public display of Churchmanship in the voluntary fund for Church education in the manufacturing districts, which deserves to be commemorated among the noticeable successes of the Church cause. 'Sir Robert Peel's Act,' for dividing and endowing parishes, was conceived in a spirit of justice to the Church; although it did not add a farthing to its revenues, and its results in multiplying pauper incumbencies, without the means, moral or material, of properly manning them, or serving the churches when manned, have proved very far from a decided advantage to the Church of England. To this epoch also belongs Archbishop Howley's Act, relieving, though incompletely, the disabilities of Scotch and American clergymen. Unfortunately the airy something, called 'Young England,'



the earliest, and the soonest abandoned, experiment of Mr. Disraeli, was confounded, in political estimation, with the Church cause, and tended not a little to damage it with practical persons. The foundation of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, a clumsy attempt at liberal Latitudinarianism, in a soil ready prepared for a brilliant experiment in denominational university creation (an experiment which would have gone far to render the recent proceedings of the Roman Hierarchy impossible), did not mend matters with Churchmen. Sir Robert Peel's obstinate and narrow opposition to the retention of the Welsh bishoprics, at the price of the creation of the one new see of Manchester, created a sore, and the repeal of the Corn-laws most unluckily converted a large mass of the country clergy into acrimonious politicians. So fell, in 1846, the famous Peel Government, towards the establishment of which High Churchmen had rushed to the poll in 1841.

But outside of political conflicts, the Church party had been passing through more than one trying crisis. The wretched Jerusalem bishopric disheartened sound-minded men, and cut the last thread which kept Mr. Newman's mind in doubt. Mr. Ward's audacious, though able, and in many parts edifying, 'Ideal of a Christian Church,' which appeared in 1844, provoked, as might have been expected, fierce opposition, and that opposition took hold of the most indefensible passages in the work. The still more indefensible policy adopted by his opponents of depriving him of his University degree, by an act of judicial legislation, called out the collective power of so much of the Church party as belonged to Oxford; and though they were outvoted, their united action tended (though in an unpopular cause) to consolidate their forces. On the other hand, the veto by which the proctors so courageously disposed of a needless condemnation of Tract 90, elicited an address from all shades of Oxford High Churchmen, which served as another roll-call of the party in one University. The Littlemore section meanwhile grew more and more decided, and culminated in the 'Lives of the British Saints.' Mr. Oakeley capped Mr. Ward by his claim to 'hold all Roman doctrine.' Mr. Ward in turn married and seceded. Mr. Newman's self-imposed period of probation drew to a close, and the crash of 1845 came. Ward, Newman, Oakeley, Faber, and other somewhat conspicuous names followed one after another with a quick succession into the Roman fold. Shaken as the cause and the party necessarily were by the secession of so many men of note, they not only maintained their lost ground, but even acquired fresh territory.

The secession of Mr. Newman corresponded with the consecration of S. Saviour's, Leeds; and the occasion was chosen for a great

muster of the forces, although unfortunately the coincidence of these and other subsequent events tended to create alienations not confined to that place, the existence of which had better be regretted than revived. Besides, the Church party had at last secured its own journalistic organ. For about two or three years, the *English Churchman*, which started in 1843, after an abortive attempt on the part of Mr. Gathercole, was conducted with vigour and breadth of mind, and filled up the void very satisfactorily. Gradually, however, that paper became crotchety, and more than crotchety; but in the meanwhile the *Guardian* had been set on foot, and has ever since maintained a position of respectability, sense, and talent, to which we yield our grateful and sincere homage. In our earlier days, as a monthly magazine, we flatter ourselves that the *Christian Remembrancer* was not useless to the rising cause and party. The extinction of the *British Critic* cleared the way for some new Quarterly to take its place, and we stepped forward in a new form. Simultaneously another Review was started, also claiming to speak in the name of the Church cause. Unhappily this long defunct contemporary, the *English Review*, added no permanent strength to the common stock. Though ably supported, at first it began with being timid, it degenerated into utter suspicion and faint-heartedness, and it ended in a few years with something like abandoning the cause at a most critical moment, and then expired. Besides much injury to Churchmanship, it tended to throw out of the active service of the party and the cause abilities and learning which had been at one time honoured and energetic.

With the dissolution of Parliament by Lord John Russell, in 1847, a fresh chapter of our history commences. The wounds of 1845 had begun to heal over, and the Church cause was thriving in its visible work and practical exertions. Mr. Edward Coleridge, for example, had stirred up all hearts by his noble scheme (the correlative of the Colonial Bishops movement) of a Missionary College, commenced indeed before the secessions, but not interrupted by them, which had already found its *locale* at Canterbury. Similar projects on various sides were daily gaining strength, and Churchmen were saying to each other, 'Once we thought it would have been all up with the Church cause when Mr. Newman went; but see the difference.'

Mr. Gladstone's election for Oxford, at the general election of 1847, was assuredly one of the triumphs of Churchmanship. Lord John Russell's erection of the see of Manchester had gained him popularity. At this conjuncture the aged and munificent Archbishop of York unexpectedly died, and the translation of his successor left the see of Hereford vacant. To this see the

potential commander of the Channel Fleet chose, of all men living, to appoint Dr. Hampden, in order, as he phrased it in a letter to certain remonstrants (Lord John Russell is great in letters), 'to strengthen the Protestant character of our Church, 'so seriously threatened of late by many defections to the 'Church of Rome.' This audacious act consolidated and invigorated the Church party, which had now, for the first time since 1833, the good opportunity of a united demonstration; the first Hampden, the Tract 90, and the Ward affairs having been exclusively Oxford movements, and the last of them fought on a very unlucky issue. Few of our readers will have forgotten the gallant struggle which came to a dead-lock, not a defeat, in an equally divided Court of Queen's Bench. Dr. Hampden was Bishop of Hereford, and the Church party was fairly in the field. At this moment, the death of Archbishop Howley tended to inspire vigour into its counsels. Though the extreme Oxford section had been accustomed to make indiscriminate sport of the old High Church party, yet their merriment did not enlist a large circle of sympathisers; and none but the most flippant could fail to draw the distinction between the bucolic specimens of easy-going 'parsons,' who still lingered in various counties, and the deep-read, though very cautious divines, who had been the leaders of orthodoxy before the Tracts were dreamed of. The natural recoil from the secessions of 1845 of course tended to augment the influence of these more ancient leaders; and in 1846 and 1847, until the Hampden excitement, the Church party rested under the hegemony of Archbishop Howley and Bishop Blomfield, backed by the *grand seigneur* influence of the still more aged Archbishop Harcourt, the princely Beresford of Armagh, the *vivida vis* of the Bishop of Exeter, and the energy of the recently consecrated Bishop of Oxford, the five first, in their respective ways, grand specimens of the old school, the last a man born to lead in the new generation. But Archbishop Howley followed Archbishop Harcourt in a few weeks to the grave, and the metropolitan thrones were filled up by prelates especially selected by Lord John Russell, with the view of making himself disagreeable to the Church party, and that party accordingly felt itself thrown upon its own resources, just at a crisis when it had the spirit and the will to act for itself. The bench of Bishops still contained tried men of scholarly renown, and worthy of all respect. But its 'High Church' nuance was gone. The Newman lead, as we have seen, had long ceased. The subsequent phase of a deference to the episcopate, from its personal no less than its official qualifications, was not so easy a task as it had been a little before. A new phenomenon manifested itself, and a new period of excitement

began, during which more completely than either before or afterwards a Church 'party' existed.

The circumstances of the Hampden affair had brought together leading Churchmen, lay and clerical, in frequent and confidential consultation. Those whose head-quarters were London, met men of ability and earnestness from the country, and naturally desired that the intimacy so erected might not be allowed to cool. Parenthetically it may be observed, that an unusually large proportion of the country Churchmen who assembled on the occasion came from the dioceses of Gloucester and Bristol, and of Bath and Wells; the city of Bristol being at the time a very important centre of Churchmanship. For several years, too, that Management Clauses fight had gone on at the annual meeting of the National Society, which ended in a virtual triumph to the spirit rather than the letter of the Church party's plea, and which, we believe, taught the officials of that day the lesson which they have not yet forgotten, that there is a Church in England, and that Englishmen will not stand bureaucracy, especially in the matter of education. A 'minister of education' was the lowest possible depth of evil then grimly hinted at on the part of the Church champions, particularly the energetic Mr. Denison. A minister of education has since been created, and he fulfils the useful, though it may not be heroic task, of moving education grants every year, out of which the Church reaps by far the greatest profit. Accordingly, the result of the continual meetings was that a scheme was started, which ought to have been thought of years before, to create a species of voluntary 'Church Cabinet'—a council of Churchmen, lay and clerical, of proved capacity, who should exercise a central influence in London, on Church matters, over a Church party which was willing to accord to it its confidence. Accordingly, 1848 saw the creation of what was called the 'Watching Committee on Church Matters,' sitting in London, but including virtual representatives of local Churchmanship. The functions of this body were strictly those of deliberation and advice, with a special view to the parliamentary and political fortunes of the Church; and while no name was put upon its list whose Churchmanship was not above suspicion, it was so formed as to combine theologians, lawyers, and men of the public world, deliberating in the same committee on terms of equality. During the preceding year, a similar movement, but of a more popular complexion, had been going on at Bristol (which was then, as we have said, a sort of second centre of Churchmanship), resulting in the formation of the famous Bristol Church Union, a society differing from the Watching Committee in having a general body, which met, deliberated, and elected the

governing committee. Church Unions at Gloucester and elsewhere were soon created in imitation of the one at Bristol. To all these institutions the Watching Committee stood in the position of a central and controlling body; the leaders of the local unions were, generally speaking, enrolled on its list; and the most perfect harmony existed between the London and the country organization. A new want, however, made itself felt in the capital itself. The general Church public of London had no deliberative machinery. Whether a *permanent* voluntary machinery for deliberation in London were a desirable and judicious thing at that time was another matter; it was also a question, which might reasonably have admitted of doubt, how far the peculiar and deliberate functions of the Watching Committee were consistent with a perpetual overlooking by a general body, or with the principle of existing upon the tenure of periodical re-election at the hands of that body. There were, in fact, three questions to be dealt with,—whether a Church Union for London on the Bristol plan were desirable, whether that Union ought to exist independently of, but in subordination to, the Watching Committee, or whether it ought to be its emanation. The last alternative was adopted, and by 1849 the transformation of the Watching Committee into the 'London Union on Church Matters' was complete. In framing its new constitution (for the Watching Committee itself created the constitution on which it admitted a general body), it strove to maintain in the 'Committee' of the 'Union' the purposes for which it originally existed as a cabinet. It was, to be sure, liable to annual re-election; but it ran the risk of the rejection of a house-list, and it reserved to itself unlimited power of adding to its numbers during the twelvemonth of office. Although the 'Corresponding Societies' Act,' in the opinion of its legal members, who were several of them judges of the land and eminent barristers, forbade any formal representative organization, it took pains to make itself virtually representative, by placing on its list, more extensively than before, the prominent officers and members of local unions, and active Churchmen in districts where no union existed. It extended the same principle to the composition of its general body, and gave it to be understood that it solicited recruits from all parts of the country. To avoid invidia, while it appointed a permanent treasurer and secretary, it did not name, and never has named, any permanent president or chairman; although for many years one honoured member has always, when present, filled the chair. On the committee appeared the names of judges and Regius Professors, peers and members of Parliament, squires and dignitaries, distinguished teachers of the Oxford school, and leaders of the

'old' High Church party, all heartily engaged in the same good cause.

Now, it must be acknowledged that a Church Society so organized, if it had simply gone before the world upon a constitution such as we have described it, however righteous and justifiable in itself—and under the actual circumstances of the cause, we fully believe it was both—it would have symbolized the energy rather than the discipline of Churchmanship. But behind the printed lists of the Union committee and general body stood a personage grave in dignity. The committee formally submitted its rules to the Bishop of London, Dr. Blomfield; and he not only entirely approved them, after a careful revision, but allowed himself to be considered as the patron of them; acutely and good-humouredly observing that he treated the Society as 'Mr. Union,' and justified it in acting as any single Churchman might do under similar circumstances. Bishop Blomfield was the diocesan of the head-quarters of this Union; he was a distinguished statesman no less than prelate, and his then twenty-one years' episcopate of a see, metropolitical all but in name, gave him a weight which did not at once attach to the ecclesiastical dignitary of higher precedence. His patronage of the London Union, which was made no secret, was the one thing needed to consolidate its position. The country unions, at the same time, were, for the most part, fortunate in obtaining the approbation, more or less pronounced, of their respective diocesan.

The Church party so organized had only itself to blame for not being able to make the fullest use of its opportunities. But an unhappy schism followed upon the very heels of the 'London Union.' We approach this branch of our subject with great reluctance; some, indeed, of those who made themselves prominent in the opposition have since trained off from any public participation in the Church movement; others, however, are now combating for the same Church cause, thoroughly trusting in and trusted by those who were, eleven years ago, among the founders of the London Union; while some of them long joined its committee. They must forgive us for not being able to pass over so important an episode in our history. Somehow a society came into existence termed the Metropolitan Church Union: and—not to analyse causes more deeply—this association justified not so much its own existence as its open oppugnancy to the London Union upon the fact that that body would not, at the somewhat peremptory appeal of its rival's inchoate executive, alter its constitution (approved as it was by the Bishop) by the insertion of a categorical and specific declaration in favour of the revival of Convocation.



It may seem strange in 1860 for any society of Churchmen to have been unwilling to take such a step with or without five minutes' notice. But when it was urged, the Gorham judgment had not been delivered, nor the Papal Aggression taken place; and the question, which was one of policy, not of principle, as to whether the scope of the Union should be declared in general terms, or should include any specific objects, was one upon which persons with identical views might easily hold different opinions. The committee of the London Union were the last men to declare against the revival of Convocation, a revival which they themselves desired to promote, and they accordingly made no such declaration. They all looked forward to self-government as the thing to be ultimately compassed by the Church; but they considered that it was the more expedient course for them, situated as they then were, not to commit themselves in their laws—a public document—to this specific item of aggressive Churchmanship. Their policy in those laws was to stand on the defensive, rather than ostentatiously to demand any additional advantage. By so doing they considered that the real likelihood of obtaining such advantages peaceably and securely, would be insured. The requisition of the more impatient section was, be it noted, not for a private though official assurance of the strong desire on the part of the executive of the London Union for the re-establishment of representative or synodical action in the Church of England; this was heartily at their service; but for a specific change in its constitution—a constitution, as we have shown, framed under the eye of judges, and approved by the Bishop of London—enunciating the revival of Convocation at that time of day as a specific end of the Union's existence. The committee declined to alter its constitution at the requisition of a separatist and somewhat unfriendly body; and the 'Metropolitan Church Union' published itself as in direct rivalry to the 'London Union on Church matters.' A more unfortunate thought than that of organizing at such a moment a rival body, competing for the leadership of the Church cause and party, could not have crossed the human mind. The Church party, after many vicissitudes and severe trials, had, at length found out the duty and the possibility of united action, and had entered upon it under the happiest auspices. It would have been but ordinary prudence to have waived even grave differences in favour of such a result. But in this case there was no fundamental difference of principle, only one of policy as in the face of a jealous public. However mistaken the minority might have considered the majority, their constitutional and judicious course, with the interests of the Church at stake, would have been that of a decided though

friendly opposition within the society itself, until they became a majority, accomplished a coalition, or were converted. They preferred hostility to opposition, and the unhappy results of their policy were not slow in appearing. The London Union was of course at once engaged in a contest, not with the opponents of the Church cause, but with the antagonistic competitor for the leadership of the Church party. The apparent taint of personal partisanship came out in all that it did, and in all that was done by the Metropolitan Union. The country Unions were naturally perplexed, and called upon the rivals to coalesce. The London Union, strong as it was in the broad representation of High Churchmanship of all shades upon its committee, and in the approbation given to its rules and to itself of the Bishop of London, which the other society had not been fortunate enough to win, could only offer to absorb that body upon terms honourable and advantageous to its individual members. It would not be absorbed; and although the country Unions strongly manifested their preference for, and confidence in, the earlier and more powerful body, the antagonistic organization still continued to exist, meet, speak, and publish.

1850 began with a brilliant Church demonstration—Mr. Talbot's public meeting in favour of Church education, arising out of the standing fight with the Government under Sir. J. Kay Shuttleworth's inspirations. And the Bishop of London's attempted Church Discipline Bill was one of the best which has ever been essayed. March arrived, and the Gorham judgment startled society. The instinct of Churchmen was of course to fly to their arms, and, in face of the common calamity, personal considerations were out of the question. A very strong protest, signed by twelve influential names, was among the earliest notes of the battle—the paper testified to the gravity of the occasion, but its first clause on the eventual effect of the judgment was, we think, open to grave objections; the force of which became before very long painfully apparent. Protests upon protests multiplied: the frequency and numbers of the meetings of the general body of the London Union converted it into a sort of ecclesiastical parliament in London. The Bishop of Exeter's letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which was speedily published, ruled of course the policy of the Church party. The Bishop of London's refusal to acquiesce in the judgment enhanced his already strong claims on Churchmen for their gratitude and confidence. A short published letter of his to a prominent lay member of the London Union, clearly laying down the duty of patient persistence in the Church of England, and pointing to Convocation, attracted much attention. At length a strong feeling became apparent for a great public meeting in London

to protest against the judgment, and a joint committee of the London and Metropolitan Unions was constituted to organize it. The policy of such a step was of course canvassed in various ways. A monster meeting is always an easy way for men who do not really care for their responsibilities to get out of their obligations to their constituents in a blaze of meaningless invective. But those whose whole hearts were absorbed by that crisis, were not the people to act in this perfunctory way. It might seem to the bystanders that those who were the most really earnest for the Church cause were the men who pressed the strongest for the meeting; the lukewarm, those who hesitated. But any one who might have so supposed, would have judged harshly; there was, in fact, a strong underlying divergence of intention in the minds of those who with more or less of eagerness desired the meeting. There were some who simply obeyed the unreasoning afflatus of doing something energetic to enliven an intolerable oppression, or pacify an equally painful irritation of spirits; others, listening to nothing but their own enthusiasm, had persuaded themselves that the meeting could not fail to be so numerous and so determined as to be, in effect, a physical triumph for the Church's cause; others hugged the notion, that however much involved the Church of England might be in the judgment, yet a collective protest against it would not only purge their own individual consciences of complicity in it, but go far to purge the corporate Church also. Others were unable to see how a mere voluntary assemblage, whose success was still uncertain, would mend or mar the Church of England's formal position; but were at the same time anxious not only to give a vent to their own and brother Churchmen's feeling of grief and indignation, but also—supposing there to be a reasonable prospect of success—to turn the meeting to practical and politic account, by showing the strength of the Church party, and making a public demand for that synodical action, of the necessity of which in some form all shades of real Churchmen had become convinced. Finally, there was a small party, the existence of which some persons suspected more than others, who had already gone far in losing faith in the Church of England, and who (unconsciously, we are willing to believe, to themselves) were anxious for the meeting as a sort of summing up of accounts, a last effort, of which the incomplete success, according to their measure of completeness, might justify any ulterior steps.

The Romeward tendency involved in these feelings was sufficiently apparent to raise alarm, but their danger to the cause (whatever that might have been) did not at first so much rest upon the fear of any extensive defection to the Church of Rome,

as upon the vague desire which possessed many minds, even those who were ordinarily cool, judicial, and moderate, in favour of an orthodox 'free Church' of England, which would live on, alongside of the Establishment, peaceful within and determined in its attitude towards all outside. Less enthusiastic Churchmen shook their heads, some from the strong conviction of the essentially schismatic character of the scheme, others from the practical recollection of the history of Nonjurism. These aspirations of course died away, after having produced nothing more tangible than the letter in favour of union with the Greek Church which appeared in Scotland: but the existence of such a tone of thought was not a thing to be ignored by those upon whom the responsibility of the future meeting rested.

It is not betraying confidence to say that in the joint committee the eagerness for the meeting was originally stronger on the part of the representatives of the Metropolitan than of the London Union. The meeting had been advertised for June 27, when the Church world was suddenly startled by the announcement that a resolution had been taken to postpone it. In a few days, it was announced that the postponement was not *sine die*, but only till July 23, on which day effectively it came off. Few people are probably aware of the full motives of those who carried this postponement. It was neither timidity nor was it any wavering of faith in the Church of England, but the reverse. Not to speak of the impropriety of meeting at a time when the Bishop of Exeter was still fighting in the courts of common law, it had become apparent to their minds, although in a form so impalpable as to render the breathing of any such suspicion in the highest degree unjustifiable, that a subtle influence had been at work, and was gaining a strong ascendancy in the joint councils, which seemed to be hardly consistent with strict abiding faith in the actual Church of England, whether it ultimately led to the ideal 'free' Church, or to the so-called '*caput urbis et orbis*.' What was more perplexing was, that this influence seemed to be active with that section of the body whose Anglicanism was the most unduly suspicious of others' steadfastness, but which had unfortunately suspected in the wrong direction. Practically, too, the arrangements were woefully behindhand, and there was very great risk that the gathering might have turned out a *mêlée*. A few persons, accordingly, keeping their graver suspicions to themselves, persuaded the joint committee, upon strong practical grounds, to the postponement, the motion being made by one whose absence from England for several months and then recent return enabled him to form a cooler and more dispassionate estimate of the state of matters than others, who had for weeks been at a fever heat of excitement. By so doing they

knowingly subjected themselves to the imputation of covert motives; but they submitted to the charge with cheerfulness, convinced, as they were, that they had done the best thing to save the Church movement at that crisis from imminent though concealed peril.

The success of the meeting surpassed the expectations of all moderate men. It had not of course any visible effect on Parliament or the Episcopal Bench; but it was no common event to behold two large public halls, S. Martin's and Freemasons', filled simultaneously with crowded assemblages of gentle and noble, prelate, dignitary, and lord, layman and priest, presenting the rare example of deep feeling controlled by perfect propriety and the sense of the unseen, under the influence of oratory the more powerful because it came from and spoke to the heart. The resolutions adopted were clear and practical; they protested against the judgment doctrinally, and they pointed to Convocation as the only source from which an efficient remedy could be sought. Some things might have been said in the speeches which had better have been avoided, but in face of such a triumph men were not disposed to be critical. Mr. Hubbard's able Chairmanship at S. Martin's Hall greatly conduced to the success. The public press of all shades of opinion was the best witness to the good results of the day, for we believe that without an exception it treated the meeting with respect, however angry many of the journals may have been.

The Church party seemed at that moment on the point of a cordial and perfect consolidation, when an event took place, of small account in itself, indeed, but one which justified the fears and again stirred up the suspicions of the two sections of that joint committee which had conducted the meeting. Under the influence of the 'Metropolitan' section, the second meeting in Freemasons' Hall—an almost *extempore* phase of the demonstration—was, by a very hasty choice, placed under the chairmanship of a young nobleman, of a most amiable character, but not conspicuous for stirring talents, who seemed to give the desired guarantee of 'No-popery,' from his having been, only three years before, the almost successful 'anti-Maynooth' opponent of Mr. Goulburn for the University of Cambridge. Just six weeks after the meeting, Churchmen were startled with the intelligence that Lord Feilding had joined the Church of Rome, and that at the time he presided over one of these great meetings his faith in the English Communion was, though he declared it not, vitally shaken. Some persons felt more than they liked to express how painfully this unexpected secession justified their fears of an occult influence distracting the councils of those who honestly thought themselves the special bulwarks against any

Romanising tendencies. It was not to be supposed that these persons took the same view of their own mistake, and accordingly the weekly paper which was then the organ of their particular colour of Churchmanship declared, in announcing Lord Feilding's secession, that 'it is high time for the true-hearted friends of the Church to look about them, and demand 'of all who claim a place in their ranks, whatever may be their 'station or character, a solemn pledge of determined antagonism 'to Rome, and faithful adherence to the doctrine and communion of the truly Catholic and Apostolic Church of England.' The meaning of these words was not long doubtful; for notice of motion was given in the Bristol Church Union (which still held its given position of second leading body in the Church party), by the Rev. W. Palmer,—one whose early services make his then policy and his later silence matter of deep regret,—of a voluntary test, including an anti-Roman declaration, over and above the repudiation of Roman error which runs through all the symbolical writings of the English Church. The persons at whose head this missile was aimed felt equally indignant at an imputation against themselves which they knew to be groundless, and alarmed at the suspicious and suicidal policy of multiplying voluntary and superfluous tests beyond and beside the basis of the Church itself. There was, accordingly, a great gathering of forces at Bristol, on October 1st; and after a spirited debate (in which no one took part who has not ever since remained firm to the Church of England), the test was rejected by an overwhelming majority, in favour of a carefully drawn amendment; and so the leadership of the 'London' section was accepted and confirmed by what was virtually a representative meeting of the Church party. A crowded meeting of the London Union itself, in a few days, reasserted the amendment, brought forward by the committee as a substantive motion, and the country bodies followed the example.

Satisfactory as the result was to those Churchmen who proved to be the majority, the painful feeling remained that the victory of one side was the defeat of the other, and that the inevitable result must be to perpetuate, for the present, not merely an opposition, but a split in that which ought to have been an undivided party. Still, there seemed to be again the prospect of ultimate and peaceful consolidation, the only apparent rock ahead being the threatened repetition of the secessions of 1845—an event for which the world had been partly prepared by such pamphlets as those of Mr. Allies and Mr. Maskell on the Supremacy, although the precise extent to which the sapping of leading theological minds had gone was not generally suspected. Besides the rally made by Churchmen during



the summer of 1850, in defence of sacramental doctrine, the synodical question had been brought before the Lords by Lord Redesdale, and before the Commons by Mr. Gladstone, in reference to the Colonial Church; and the season had been for London one of remarkable and cheering progress in the ritualistic and devotional revival; witnessing as it had done, within a very few weeks, the successive consecrations of S. Stephen', Shepherd's Bush (the offering of the Bishop himself); S. Barnabas', Pimlico; S. Stephen', Rochester Row; S. Mary's, Crown Street. Suddenly, without preparation, a thunderbolt fell, and everything seemed in an instant reduced to chaos. On Michaelmas-day, two days before the Bristol meeting, Pius IX. had signed the unlucky Brief *Universalis Ecclesiæ*, and the kingdom went mad about the Papal Aggression.

The first phase of the hurly-burly was, that although Churchmen had just learned so sharp a lesson in the Gorham judgment, as to the evils of Erastianism, and the perils of an undue stretch of the 'Supremacy,' and although at every meeting throughout the year they had declared, deeper and deeper, their determination to resist this pressing danger to the utmost, they yet allowed themselves, to a great degree, to be so carried off by contagious excitement, as in considerable numbers to protest against the aggression in language and for reasons which absolutely committed the protesters to the most unmitigated recognition of the Erastian bondage of our Church. This was bad enough; but the panic began to slacken, and Churchmen to return to their wits, when the *émeute* took another turn. Early in November, the Bishop of London delivered his quadriennial charge; and in this document, after having most fully and satisfactorily treated of the Gorham judgment, he proceeded to speak of ritualistic development in language of strong unexpected rebuke, and in a tone which looked very like personality. Churchmen did not know what to make of this outburst; the circumstances which led to it (mistake as it was) were not at the time apparent, and it was doubtless written before the 'Papal aggression' had flayed alive the public mind. But it fell at an unlucky moment; for Lord John Russell, snatching at its expressions with tortuous and greedy ingenuity, caricatured and exaggerated them in his infamous and incendiary Durham Letter, claiming the Bishop of London as on his side. Then

'Limitibus ruptis infert se spumeus amnis.'

The Pope and Cardinal Wiseman soon became secondary persons compared with the persecuted 'Tractarians.' S. Barnabas, beset with riotous mobs, worse even than those who have defiled

S. George's-in-the-East this year, was the central object of an interest every day more painful, only relieved by the broad burlesque of Lord Ashley's impertinent anti-ritualistic meeting at Freemasons' Hall, where he expressed his desire for *al fresco* worship with Lydia 'on the banks of the river side,' or chequered by the mendacious circular of the National Club to the churchwardens of England, in which the confession escaped that Churchmen were a 'large party,' an acknowledgment worked to the utmost in a series of letters on Church matters in the *Morning Chronicle*, which were then commenced; when the incredible news was bruited abroad that the Bishop of London had called on Mr. Bennett to resign, and that Mr. Bennett perforce must go. A more painful blunder never was committed by public man than what the good, and we will add great, Bishop Blomfield committed on that occasion. The excuse for him, we truly believe, is to be found in the significant expression that he had lost, for the instant, his head—a pardonable though deplorable loss on the part of an aging man, overtaxed with responsibilities at a season of universal mania. The Bishop, an old High Churchman, had not been unwilling to head the men of the revival in many a gallant contest, but he was constitutionally unable to face anything like public opposition. He was a great general; but incapable of meeting a disaster or a check. He had often, indeed, given his friends somewhat rough rebukes; but that was in accordance with his rather boisterous though kind-hearted nature. He meant less malice than many men who never gave knocks so hard. Though he respected art and ritualism, his studies had not led him beyond an elementary acquaintance with them. However, he tolerated much more than he would personally have adopted; and yet, as, for instance, in his own church at Shepherd's Bush, he did substantially adopt the main features of the ecclesiological revival. His largest act of toleration was S. Barnabas. Unfortunately, at S. Barnabas, he was brought into contact with a person who never could understand him, and whom the Bishop reciprocally could not understand. Mr. Bennett, it must be confessed, with all his high claims upon the respect and admiration of Churchmen, has, unhappily, an unconciliatory strain in his character, which made itself specially apparent in his dealings with the Bishop. He might, we believe, have perfectly managed his somewhat exigent, but not naturally inimical diocesan; he contrived instead to aggravate him at the time he was composing his charge, and wound up an inconsidered correspondence by that most unwise act of placing his conditional resignation in the Bishop's hands. The Bishop, thoroughly frightened by the mobs at the church, was injudicious enough

to avail himself of the power so irregularly placed at his disposal, without, we believe, any other object than the immediate and narrow one of restoring public peace.

He had, however, totally misapprehended and miscalculated the state of the public and of the Church mind. Mr. Bennett's dismissal could not but be taken in connexion with the Durham Letter, the Lydian meeting, and similar outrages; and in one day, sad to say, the Bishop lost the confidence of the Church party, to which, since the Gorham judgment, he exclusively belonged, and found himself in the unfortunate predicament, that, dealing with an angered and unaccommodating antagonist, he was unable to escape from his false position. An incidental evil of the catastrophe was a breach between the Bishop and the London Union on Church Matters, which felt itself compelled to express its sympathy with Mr. Bennett.

We hurry over the events of the first quarter of 1851. The frantic onslaught on ritualism ended in smoke; the compromising declaration of nearly all the episcopal bench did neither the harm nor the good that was anticipated: Lord John Russell went out to come in again a crippled minister, and pressed his puerile Ecclesiastical Titles Bill forward in the midst of the undisguised contempt of all thinking men. At Easter appeared the Bishop of Exeter's Pastoral, a document embracing in language of the keenest point and yet most sustained dignity, and with a tone of unyielding Churchmanship, a *précis* of the entire fortunes of the whole Church cause during the preceding eventful year, and ending with the announcement of his intention to hold a Diocesan Synod in the following summer; and a publication and a policy both of them so bold fairly took away the breath of antagonistic parties. The Synod was held, and its proceedings fully justified the expectations with which it had been called.

With this Synod was closed the Gorham-Wiseman chapter of the history of the Church cause and of the Church party. Although, of course, the obnoxious judgment remained unrevoked, its practical result had been to awaken a deeper and wider conviction of baptismal doctrine in the minds of English Churchmen than had previously existed. The Russell-Ashley aggression against the worship of the Church had also come to nought. Churchmen were united in the conviction of the necessity of proximate synodical action in the Church of England. In one word, the bark of the Church cause had weathered the storm, although in its passage through the rocks and quicksands she had lost a few valued members of the crew, who had thrown themselves overboard, and swum for what they believed was the safe haven of Rome.

But the Church party was not the same calm collected body which it had shown itself upon the 23d of July. The two preceding seasons had been times of frightful and abnormal excitement. It could not have been otherwise. As in seasons of political revolution 'clubs' became a necessity of general life, so had meetings, speeches, pamphlets, and counter-pamphlets become the daily sustenance of the Church party. Now came the difficulty for its leaders to keep up the *esprit de corps*, and yet withhold the continuous stimulant which was no longer necessary and would have been deleterious. The country was studded with Church Unions: what was to be the business carved out for them? The general body of the London Union was a 'Demus,' reposing indeed great confidence in its committee, but still a Demus. That committee, while regulating the enthusiasm of its followers, had never forgotten its original condition of a self-elected watching Church cabinet, and it had never ceased to consider this function as of extreme importance. The *Guardian* and the *Morning Chronicle* (which had become a professed organ of Churchmanship, and so continued for several years) laboured to keep up the spirit of the party, and yet to regulate its ardour; and in both these papers the committee of the London Union was regarded as the central authority. The Metropolitan Union did not, indeed, cease to exist, but it gradually retired into obscurity beside the 'Society for the Revival of Convocation,' established indeed in the *locale* of that Union, but possessing none of the features of oppugnancy by which the Metropolitan was characterised; a society, in short, which undertook one great specific practical work, and has most perseveringly and successfully carried out its mission. Not even the persons who alleged the ambiguity of the London Union in 1849 as to Convocation could now find fault with its zeal in that cause. We believe it did much to foster the revival of the Convocation of Canterbury; but, when we say so, we gladly acknowledge the special claims of the other body which existed for that one specified end. Convocation was openly, ever since the great meeting, a most important end of the London Union, but it had many others of great moment besides. Contemporaneously with the revival of the Convocation of Canterbury, as a deliberative assembly, which came to pass in the autumn of 1852, the Colonial Church, in its different dioceses, began its successful agitation for a synodical government which should be legislative as well as deliberative. This movement did not fall within the scope of the Convocation Society; but the committee of the London Union, in its occasional reports, made itself the mouthpiece of the home Church party upon the synodical cause in the colonies. A new com-

plication grew out of this policy. There was not a single colony into whose synodical assembly the laity were not called to bear their part. The same question of laity in Synod was raised on Scottish ground in Mr. Gladstone's letter to Primus Skinner; and the English deputation to the General Convention of the American Church in 1853 brought the spectacle of active representative government in a mixed assembly of clergy and laity prominently before the eyes of Churchmen. The London Union could not avoid having an opinion upon the question, and that which it sustained was in favour, although very moderately expressed, of a place being found for the laity in Church assemblies. The controversy which this raised ranged over a considerable time, and we have no desire to recall its vicissitudes or rake up its embers. The letters on Church matters in the *Morning Chronicle*, by D.C.L., took up the lay side; Mr. Cleveland Coxe came forward in vindication of the American Church. Mr. Gladstone was answered in a pamphlet by 'Cautus,' a signature supposed to conceal a name of great weight; and, later, Dr. Pusey appeared on the anti-lay side with his 'Ancient Precedents.' The immediate effect upon the London Union committee was to lose for it support, the absence of which it much regretted, and which it would have gladly retained, and, as it thought, did enough to retain by dropping the controversy as far as it was concerned. Without attempting to grapple with the actual dispute, we think that the section who supported the lay side were somewhat hardly dealt with. The opponents of the admission of the laity to representative rights took up grounds most assuredly sound in themselves. They argued against the risk of the doctrine of the Church being left to chance majorities, or causes of faith being subjected to the judicial determination of elected, possibly ignorant, or ill-disposed judges. They appealed to the absence of proof as to laymen ever having sat in ancient Synods. The reply to these allegations was the admission of their truth, with a reservation as to the known influence in councils of the early Christian emperors, and the constant presence of lay assessors, being arguments from analogy on the side of the laity; and with the further allegation that all which the pro-lay party wished for might be effected without detriment to the principles which these statements involved. In fact, the whole matter, they said, was a confusion of terms arising out of the use of the word 'Synod.' They had no particular and exclusive love for that word, but it happened to have come to hand on both sides as the current term to express a formal meeting for the regulation of Church concerns.

The old Synods, when printing was unknown, and travelling

slow, costly, and hazardous, were exceptional gatherings, and acted either as Church courts to try supposed offenders against doctrine or discipline, or in the analogous capacity of constituent assemblies, to decree canons of faith and discipline. By all means, said they, preserve and reserve sacredly and exclusively these functions to the *clerum*. Call the meetings which settle them Synods or courts, as you like best. But after you have preserved and reserved everything which you can prove has ever come within the prerogatives of any primitive or mediæval Synod, you will find that the Church of this writing, printing, discussing, travelling, statistical age is eyes-deep in a complication of business, secular in all its details, and only ecclesiastical in as much as it refers to the Church. You have your Christian Knowledge Society, your Propagation of the Gospel and Church Missionary Societies, your National Society, your General and Diocesan Church Building Societies, your Additional Curates' Society, your Sons of the Clergy, your Clergy Provident Society—you have most of them sitting in London, and the permanent correlatives of all these associations in every county and diocese. In the administration of all and every one of these bodies, laymen are solicited to take a part, and do so accordingly. Of several of them, laymen have been the founders; and yet all and every one of them is an institution created most laudably, but upon the strictest Church principles somewhat irregularly, to fill a special gap in what ought to be the general representative organization of the Church. Above all things, consider how Parliament, an assembly which is now totally unconnected with the Church, meddles with all Church matters even the most sacred.

And so—continued to argue the advocates of the lay cause—what we ask for is not an extension of, but a restriction upon, these existing privileges of the laity. We want some general regulating representative system, composed exclusively of clergy and of *communicants* (communicating being, as far as we can learn, the test in *no* religious society), not to supersede, which would be equally wrong and inexpedient, but to 'regularize' these various associations. No clerical synod, as they urged, ever sat without a legal assessor, no clerical synod ever kept accounts without some financial agent: why then forbid Church lawyers, and Church bankers and merchants, to make themselves useful in their own particular line? We do not care, they said, for the word synod—away with it, for these mixed assemblies, call them what you please, conventions or standing committees—and reserve 'Synod' and 'Convocation' for the existing or any future clerical assemblies; only do not in these suspicious, susceptible times, when the standing charge against



the Church party—that of ‘priestcraft’—is so rife, show such a jealousy of the well-disposed section of Churchmen as would inevitably give colour to that most undesirable, not to say fatal, imputation. Especially do not tax us with the desire to ‘Americanise’ the Church of England, when the essence of our claim is, that communion, and not the indiscriminate something called ‘Church-membership,’ should be the qualification for a seat in the united assembly, and when we uphold as strongly as you the episcopal veto in diocesan gatherings. All guarantees which, in point of form, you would desire, we will give—in conclusion, we never dreamed of any system of voting which would not give a substantive collective vote, and therefore a veto to the representatives of the clergy, even in questions referring exclusively to the secular accidents of the Church. Whether or not the lay section of the Society made out their case by arguments such as those which we have recapitulated, is not for us to decide. We wish, however, that their opponents had taken more pains to deal with them *seriatim*, instead of intrenching themselves within the precedents of an epoch on which representative government, and the liberty of speech in the modern sense of both words, had no existence. We believe that if a free conference of the leaders of both sides could have been held, an agreement satisfactory to both might have been arrived at. Such, unfortunately, never took place, and a diversity of opinion grew up, which, we fear, has been the cause of much of the want of corporate action in the Church party ever since that time. Under what different auspices the question has been now lately raised, we will in due course proceed to show.

Politics unhappily played their part also in dividing the Church party. It was a day of triumph for Exeter Hall when high Churchmen, even those in whose behalf the eloquent voice of our greatest orator had been raised in the House of Commons, came forward to support Mr. Dudley Perceval—himself a high Churchman, and of the highest personal respectability—as Mr. Gladstone’s opponent, on that eminent statesman accepting office at the close of 1852 as Lord Aberdeen’s Chancellor of the Exchequer. We do not raise the point whether Lord Derby or Lord Aberdeen were the better minister for the Church; but we are decidedly of opinion that it would have been an equal mistake for all the members of the Church party to have attached themselves to one side or to the other. They have in practice not done so, and the result is that the Church cause has good friends on both sides of the two houses. But it was the worst mistake of all to make Mr. Gladstone’s joining the coalition Cabinet a reason for withholding from him the confidence of

Churchmen, on the old-fashioned idea of Churchman and Tory being correlative terms.

Another and a better reason for the comparative inertness of members of the Church party, existed in the renewed vitality of Convocation. Why should we, they asked, continue irregular assemblages, such as the Church Unions, when our regular Church Parliament for the southern province at least has begun to sit and to deliberate? This question might have been more difficult to answer had the Church of England been one in doctrine and in discipline. But as she is not so, but that on the contrary almost every disputed election for Convocation is one between the high and the low Church candidate, it is the common sense policy of party warfare to maintain organizations which, if nothing else, would tend to keep together the electoral body to come to the poll and send the right man to Convocation. Besides, even the best possible Convocation would be the better for a good outside public opinion; and some regulating body must exist, if the right of petition to Convocation and to Parliament is not to be disused or abused. For these and many similar reasons, Church Unions, so far from being a superfluity in the early days of revived Convocation, would have been a most valuable auxiliary institution.

The combined result of the various causes which we have recapitulated was, that from about 1852 or 1853 the rank and file of the London Union began gradually to fall off, and the local unions to suffer in like manner, while the numbers who could be brought together to extraordinary committee meetings was not, ordinarily speaking, as large as previously. One element of the Committee's strength did not lose heart or assiduity—that nucleus of its somewhat long list (a list long because representative of the whole body), on which from the first the chief burden of its administrative and literary work has fallen. Season after season, year after year, has this nucleus met, and has done all that it was in its power to do, in face of the failing numbers and flagging interest of the general body. The true blame, if blame there be, for any comparative inertness with which it might be charged, is due, not to this nucleus, but to the general body, for without their support the Committee must of course be comparatively powerless. In the original days of the 'Watching Committee on Church Matters,' that Watching Committee of course relied for its power upon the *understood* support of the Church party. When the Watching Committee grew into the London Union, that understood support was changed into a formal one, in the shape of membership involving a slight subscription, with certain corresponding advantages. Among these advantages were occasional general meetings

for the purpose of electing members and receiving reports, making motions, and discussion. Still the administration of Church interests was intended to be left to the committee, subject to its annual re-election, and the committee was on that very account unlimited in numbers, and composed upon a virtually representative system. The parliamentary mode of debate could be fully carried out, as it was during the excitement years 1849—51, at the crowded gatherings of that body, often more numerous than many a Colonial House of Assembly. The difficulty might have been whether the committee itself was not too large to be a proper cabinet; but the mutual forbearance and friendly feeling towards each other of its members avoided this danger. From the general meetings, on the other hand, composed as they were of all subscribing members, without any test of administrative capacity, it was fair to expect confidence in the judgment and *bona fides* of the committee. We are able most unhesitatingly to say that this confidence as a rule was freely accorded, and that on no occasion where there was any difference manifested during the general meetings, was the committee ever left in a minority. Still the excitement years had left their mark behind. There was a sort of vague feverish feeling among Churchmen that unless public meetings were going on nothing was being done. In this feeling the committee could not participate, although, whenever a meeting was held, they did their best to be prepared with a report of sterling interest to the Church cause. At the same time, they felt that it was the best policy to calm down the excitement, and not encourage it by creating unnecessary work for deliberative public meetings, and so converting the Union into a debating society. Such commotions, for example, as the Westerton-Fitzroy fracas at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, did not in their eyes constitute a *casus* for calling the forces to arms. In fact, we may as well be plain, and state fairly that, with the reserve of exceptional services, the really most important work of the general body was to contribute the funds necessary to work the institution. As we have said, and now repeat at the risk of tedium, the Committee was so large as to be itself representative; besides, the cases in which the Church cause was in any peril were precisely those in which private counsels were usually more important than deliberations which might and sometimes did find their way into the *Morning Advertiser*. Any private member, moreover, had the amplest means of bringing his views and suggestions before the Committee by letter, and never missed, when he did so, receiving the fullest attention. On the other hand, for the maintenance of an effective 'Watching Committee,' whether so called, or for what was termed the Committee of a

Church Union, funds were needed—a place where the committee, and, from time to time, the general body, could meet, was indispensable—an office at which the secretary could always be available for members passing through town was also of great importance; correspondence and printing could not be carried on for nothing; services such as those which the secretary rendered deserved their acknowledgment. For all these objects there were but two available sources of income,—the large donations of a few persons, and the moderate subscriptions of a large circle of members. The subscriptions were purposely fixed very low, in order to bring in as many members as possible; and the consequence was, that when the number of those members diminished, the Union had to look to the first source of revenue. These were facts which it would have been hardly dignified to publish officially, but the instinct of the Church party ought to have made their publication unnecessary. Unfortunately, however, the recollection of 1850 made the more quiet years that followed dull by contrast; and the partizan instinct which ought to have taught Churchmen that it was worth while to pay a little in time of peace in order that when war came the defences might be serviceable, was somewhat lacking. Men who, we believe, would have been ready to go to the stake, or to have been torn by wild horses, in defence of the faith, did not see the need of, and neglected paying a trifling subscription to maintain the London Union in a condition to meet a sudden emergency.

Nevertheless, in face of such discouragement and apathy, the Committee of the Union did not throw up the cards in despair. Had it been better backed it might, as it is needless to remark, have done more efficient service; but what the service was that, standing single handed, it did effect for the Church cause, may be judged of by a few instances. Our readers may possibly recollect that a few years since a scheme was started by a fussy London Incumbent, Mr. C. Hume, and was backed unhappily by the late Bishop, for a demolition of churches both reckless and sacrilegious, in the City of London and some other populous towns, which came before Parliament in the shape of a bill introduced by Lord Harrowby. It will not be forgotten that the opposition to this measure was inaugurated by a public meeting of influential City notables, and that although the measure was not immediately dropped by its promoters, at last the idea was taken up by other heads, and finally assumed the shape of that report from a Committee of Sion College upon the Union of City parishes, which was drawn up last year during the presidency of Mr. W. Scott. The original opposition to the measure, it may not be so generally known, was planned in the committee-room of the London Union.

To proceed to events of still deeper interest, we conclude that no Churchman will deny that of all the cases (since the Gorham one) in which Church interests have been at stake before Courts of Law, the most important have been the Denison case, in which, to look at only one of its phases, the attempt was made to confine the interpretation of the articles within the liberty allowed by the Church of England, and indeed (*vide* Bishop Guest's letter) within the very intention of their framers, and that of the Belgravian churches, in which the attempt was made to cut the ritual of the Church down to a Puritan standard. In both these cases, the defence was provided from the Committee of the Union. The Denison Defence Fund was arranged in its Committee-room, although it was thought expedient not to mix up the name of a private association with a great Church cause. Again, when the suit between Mr. Liddell and Mr. Westerton became a public and not a parochial dispute, the Committee of the Union came forward, and, with the hearty approbation of the incumbent, appointed a sub-committee of its body, which thenceforward took a leading part in conducting the affair until the very day of the judgment in the Privy Council. In none of these matters, it will be seen, did the London Union obtrude its name. If it had done so, it might have earned more popular reputation, but it is doubtful whether it would have so efficiently helped the Church cause, and so it preferred the interests of that cause to its own ephemeral popularity. It may be said that the charge against it is not that of having done nothing, but of not having done enough—we answer that there is no question that it did not do as much as might under other circumstances have been done, but that the blame of this deficiency lies upon the Church party which allowed it to languish, and not upon its executive, which continued year after year to work with steadfast determination, and, as we have seen, to do so much.

It is now nearly three years since the Committee of the Union determined to make a vigorous effort to reinstate the Society in the position of leadership, which it had done nothing to forfeit, and so much to deserve. Public meetings were held, the Committee assembled in unusual numbers and greater frequency, and at the moment of the resuscitation the divorce bill was engaging the anxious thoughts of Churchmen. Pre-engaged by other hands as the leading opposition to the measure was, the Committee was yet enabled to render signal, though unproclaimed, assistance to the good work. Later in the year the Committee was again enabled to render valuable service to the Church cause, and by not parading its name to have again the satisfaction of effecting a work, without tarnishing its merit

by any breath of popularity-hunting. We quote from the annual report of December 8, 1858 :

‘The last annual meeting was held on the eve of a short autumnal session of Parliament. Use was adroitly made of this brief interval by Lord Shaftesbury to introduce into the House of Lords a bill calculated seriously to affect the parochial system, the pretext for which was found in the suspension of the Exeter Hall services by the act of the incumbent of the district in which that building stands. Churchmen are generally aware that the noble lord was induced to withdraw his bill in favour of one of a different character introduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as the representative of the Episcopal Bench. Your Committee has now no difficulty in stating that its exertions were not wanting to the negotiations which led to the framing of this measure. The bill passed the Upper House with amendments which it is not now necessary to discuss, but it was withdrawn in the House of Commons, and so the formal law remains as it was before. But in the interval the question of missionary preaching in distinction to parochial services has taken, through the indirect agency of that agitation, a very different attitude from what it had previously assumed, owing to the opening about a year since of the nave of Westminster Abbey, and, within the last ten days, of that of S. Paul’s, for Sunday evening sermons, accompanied by the full choral service. These movements are, as they profess to be, experimental. But they are experiments in the right direction, and the energy with which the two Capitular bodies took up, and popular sympathy seconded, them, is a healthy sign of life in our Church.’

The principal Parliamentary question during the remaining session of 1858, about which the Committee felt that it could exercise a useful influence, was that of the bill for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife’s sister, then for the first time introduced by Lord Bury, after it had successively passed through the hands of Lord Francis Egerton, Mr. Wortley, Mr. Heywood, and Lord St. Germans. What the Committee did was to send into every parish of England and Ireland, some 14,000 in number, a copy of a petition against the bill to both Houses of the Legislature, with the fullest directions as to their preparation and presentation, and a list of members of Parliament prepared to take charge of them, including names of such standing in the House of Commons, that within a fortnight after the issue of the paper, three of them had become Cabinet ministers, and a fourth had to give up his seat on becoming Lord Chancellor of Ireland. We need hardly say that this was neither an inexpensive nor an easy work, and the result was that less than 300 petitions were returned in reply to the circular, upon which, according to the usual course of the Committee, its name did not appear, in order that the cause in hand might not be affected by any party consideration. The petitions came amply recommended by the names of the eminent senators, who were willing to take charge of them. If, then, there is a slackening of zeal, it is not to be traced to the apathy of the London Union. The state of the Church-rate question



and the organizations already in existence about it, precluded the Union Committee from taking up an individual policy as to the rate; but the annual report gave evidence that the subject had not escaped its attention. As the year moved on, the Poole and Boyn-hill cases re-opened the controversy, always delicate and undesirable, upon confession. How the Union Committee acted in regard to Mr. Poole is best explained by another extract from the Report:

'Your Committee, at an early period of the affair, took into consideration the case of the Rev. A. Poole. As, however, it appeared upon investigation that he had wisely placed his case in the hands of legal advisers of undoubted eminence, your Committee felt that, alike in justice to those advisers, and out of regard to Mr. Poole's own interest, it could only express its confidence in them, and its recommendation to the inculpated clergyman to continue in his reliance on their advice. The recent proceedings in the Court of Queen's Bench prove the wisdom of the course pursued. The somewhat analogous Boyn-hill inquiry happily did not admit of any intervention on the part of your Committee, which has only to congratulate the Union upon the result of that proceeding.'

Incredible as it may seem, the course which the Committee pursued with respect to Mr. Poole—a course in which his incumbent, Mr. Liddell, concurred, and which he took occasion publicly to vindicate—brought down upon the Union a stream of invective, as if it had betrayed the cause of the Church by its prudent proceedings. That there should have been Churchmen so blind to the spirit of the times as to have desired public demonstrations and indignation meetings in behalf of confession, was sufficiently startling; but that they should make it a cause of complaint against the Committee of the London Union that they had not indulged this desire, is almost passing belief. No doubt by so doing they might have reaped a little temporary and noisy popularity in some quarters—but at what a risk to the whole Church cause! Anyhow, the existence of such a feeling is in itself sufficient proof of the need of a Church executive able and willing to act as the drag-chain, no less than the goad.

We have said enough to show that during 1858 the London Union was not idle. We cannot report similar activity during 1859. We have no desire to exaggerate, and so we must honestly confess that it has done very little during the past year. The reason of this inertness is no secret. Churchmen could not be persuaded of the desirability of renewing and maintaining their organization as a party. The appeal had been fairly made to them in 1857 and 1858, and they had not responded to it. Willing accordingly as the most active members of the Committee, men who have been eleven years in its harness, were and are to do their utmost for the cause and the

party, they felt that they could not be always working against a dead weight of apathy, and so we believe they are now taking a breathing-time to see whether there are any signs of a revived interest in that carefully framed organization for the Church's benefit, which has for so many years existed, and has in the opinion of its working members done much to deserve the continued confidence of Churchmen.

To turn to a more cheering prospect, the continuous success of Churchmen at all the elections for Convocation, since it became again a speaking body, in 1852, 1857, and 1859, shows how strong the position is of the Church cause throughout the country. No one, of course, can tell how much more might have been done, if those who have that cause at heart would have worked together and in concert. All praise is due to the Convocation Society for what it has done towards raising and maintaining a popular feeling in behalf of synodical action. The indefatigable labours of love of Mr. H. Hoare, on behalf of this great end, have been and are perfectly herculean. But Mr. Hoare's zeal has not been satisfied by the mere revival of Convocation; though no doubt at first he confined himself to this important work. But as time went on, the necessity of local exertions throughout the Church made itself more and more apparent; above all the need of engaging the laity in some deliberative action was one that could not any longer be blinked, and by great good fortune Mr. Hoare succeeded in striking out a scheme, which, while it avoided raising the fears of the soli-clerical section, satisfied for the time being the wishes of the pro-lay party, with the honest avowal that they should not for the future be bound to regard the settlement as an ultimatum. The plan is best described in a memorial to the dignitaries of the Church, drawn up by Mr. Hoare rather more than a year since, and adopted at a public meeting held in York:—

'1. That the clergy of this realm should be permitted to meet in their respective Convocations, as by law established.

'2. That the judicial character of Episcopal and other Visitations, as by law established, should be maintained.

'3. That where meetings of the clergy in rural deaneries are now held, they should continue to be held; and that where they are not now held, they should be set on foot, subject to the approval of the Ordinary; uniformity of practice, in every respect, being desirable in all the dioceses of England and Wales.

'4. That in the same divisions of dioceses, or in such others as may be more convenient to the Archdeacons and Rural Deans, the clergy of the locality should occasionally form themselves into consulting committees, at whose meetings certain of the laity from neighbouring parishes should be requested to give their attendance, for the purpose of common advice and mutual consultation on matters which, from time to time, the clergy may deem of sufficient importance to require the joint cognisance and consideration of the whole Church.

'5. That an association should be formed, as far as may be practicable and convenient, in every parish, for the promotion of objects calculated to create an extended interest and sympathy in behalf of the Church, such associations being invariably under the superintendence or control of the incumbent, or of the officiating minister, and the subjects selected for consideration being sanctioned by him.'

The organization sketched out in these suggestions has not been left to bloom on paper only. It had already been experimentally tried in more than one rural deanery, and during the last twelvemonth the experiment has been inaugurated in London upon an extensive scale. No doubt if it should ramify over all England, and if, in its management, zeal and discretion should be found to go hand in hand, a very powerful machinery will have been set at work in behalf of our Church as at present constituted. Why, then, we fancy we hear some one ask, lament the decay of the Church Unions, when an institution so much more systematic seems to be taking their place? We reply that, admitting its force of system and its power, we cannot agree that it takes the place of the Church Unions. This is precisely the one thing which it does not do. It is most admirable as an institution parallel to them (existing or non-existing), and as such we hail it, and desire to promote it to the utmost of our influence; but if Euclid speaks aright, parallel lines never meet. The essence of Mr. Hoare's 'Lay Consultee'—of which the worst feature is this horrid neologism—movement is that of treating the actual Church of England as one whole, and ignoring the existence of a 'High' and a 'Low' party. A society which can honestly carry out such a policy is of incontestable benefit. In the Established Church there must, short of a convulsion—which we at least have no desire to precipitate—be, for many years to come, representatives of the High and of the Low Church party; and co-existing as they do in the same establishment, there are many questions connected with that Church in which they have a common interest to unite against antagonists, whether dissenters outside the Church's fold, or cold and nominal adherents within it,—the question of Church-rates for example. Besides, in a moral point of view it is very advantageous for the Church cause to give its leading members the opportunity of meeting the leading members of the other side in friendly consultation, and of proving to them that to be a High Churchman does not involve being an antedated stake-and-faggot persecutor. Opportunities of joint consultation, without compromise of principle within the pale of the Church, are in themselves means of unmixed good. But when we have acknowledged all this, we have placed the case for the simultaneous retention of Church Unions in all the

stronger light. These bodies exist not on the principle of ignoring the existing parties in the actual Church of 1860; but on that of ignoring the possibility of a vital divergence of doctrine and discipline in the Church of the English Reformation. Divergences on minor points are cheerfully admitted, but the *sine quâ non* of belonging to a Church Union is to be what some would call a 'high,' and others a genuine Churchman—a Churchman, that is to say, whose terms of communion are the devotional and symbolical writings of the Church of England literally interpreted. No doubt there are diversities of opinion among themselves as to what constitutes a High Churchman, and as undoubtedly there is a very broad *differentia* between any High and any Low Churchman, and it is this *differentia* which forms the limit of membership in a Church Union, and which does not exist in the 'lay consultee' association. For example, not to touch upon any question of direct doctrine, had the 'lay consultees' been in force throughout England, and the Church Unions extinct, the case of *Liddell v. Westerton* might have fared differently; for, according to the informing spirit of Mr. Hoare's movement, it would have been the duty of those who had its success at heart, to refrain from breaking ground upon any topic which would bring into prominence the antagonistic co-existence of a Catholic and of a Puritan element in our Church. We need not multiply instances to prove our thesis: that, most valuable as the lay consultee movement is, it does not supply the place of the Church Union organization to the Church party.

We have now reached the present day in our very imperfect sketch of the fortunes of the Church party, and we have shown how the natural growth of the great revival of Church principles developed a body of men anxious and able to combine their own and their fellow Churchmen's exertions in some general organization for the benefit of the common cause. We have pointed out how, on various occasions, this organized party obtained successes, brilliant, indeed, but never quite complete even in the partizan object of moulding into one united policy the various sections who had, with whatever minor differences, the one great object of the Church cause at heart. We have indicated how the 23d of July seemed, for the moment, to have made this possible, and what unexpected events so soon introduced confusion into the Church's ranks. Finally, we have not scrupled to own and to regret that at this moment the 'party' is, we will not say, extinct—for this we are fully persuaded it is not—but in a state of suspended animation. We shall now turn our attention from the Church party towards the Church cause, and show how much we have to be thankful for in the progress

which, by the Divine blessing, as we humbly and fully believe, it has been making even in those years during which, had it not been a movement from above, it must have fallen into decay from the absence of any combined understanding amongst those persons who were severally devoting themselves, each in his own circle, to work out the Church revival.

Among the more favourable characteristics of later years we shall, in the first place, notice the extinction of those causes of difference which, in earlier days, separated the 'new' from the 'old' school of High Churchmen. No doubt the individual differences in zeal and in knowledge are almost as numerous as the clergy themselves, but still they are emphatically personal differences. The regular so-called 'high and dry' party—the clergy who, like the estimable Mr. Irwine, so inimitably described in Adam Bede, cared more for the ceremony than for the doctrine of Baptism,—may still exist in isolated instances; but the class has gone as a party, and there is no clergyman owning to be 'High,' who does not acknowledge with more or less of fervour, how much the Church is indebted to the movement of 1833. Several causes have concurred to this result. The inevitable course of nature in so many years, which has called away those who were the most old-fashioned—because the oldest—must undoubtedly be reckoned in the first place. But those that are left have as undoubtedly advanced with their times, and hold and practise much that would have amazed them five-and-twenty, or even twenty years ago. On the other hand, those whose professions of adherence to the new school were then tinged with the fervour of youth, have now learned to state the same facts in language more akin to the ordinary vernacular, and so win a due attention. There is many a clergyman who, at thirty-five or forty years of age, may have been either distressed or scandalized at the bold, semi-petulant assertions of the brisk collegian, who now finds himself, at the age of some fifty-five, in confidential counsel, at local committee or ruridecanal chapter, with that same collegian, grown up into a staid incumbent, on matters of mutual interest, with a perfect agreement between themselves upon the common ground of an intelligent apprehension of the system, disciplinary, ritual, and doctrinal, of the Prayer-book. We repeat that we are not so utopian as to believe, or so dishonest as to profess, that all or even the majority of the *ci-devant* 'old' party has as yet grasped the Anglo-Catholic system with the same logical completeness as the younger generation who have grown up in the study of that system as embodied in the writings of the Oxford and Cambridge leaders of the movement, and in the now common reprints of our seventeenth century divines. But they are no longer in

any antagonism to the revival of a Churchmanship beyond their own previous ideal. They worship preferentially, when in London, at churches where the Church system is best exhibited; they adopt in their own restorations or new churches (which are every day becoming more numerous) features which would have frightened them out of their proprieties when first enunciated by the 'Camden Society.' They subscribe to the right societies, they vote for the right men to Convocation, they support most warmly those colonial missions in which the Church system is exhibited with the greatest and most uncompromising fervour: in one word, they are engaged heartily in the Church 'cause' in all its external manifestations. If in their doctrinal acuteness, or in their appreciation of the organization of the Christian Church as a sacramental, even more than a disciplinary system, many of them may be more or less vague, it is the part of wisdom and charity to make the best of such shortcomings, which are but natural under the special circumstances of the revival.

The marvellous circumstance is, not that the traces of the easy-going 'old' view of Churchmanship should still be visible, but that they should have so rapidly and so generally given place to better and higher appreciations. As with the clergy, so is it with the laity, though of course the transmutation is slower and more irregular in their case; but then likewise we venture to assert that, with the visible exhibitions of the Church system more frequently and more fearlessly held up to them, so has the standard of the laity been imperceptibly raised even in that generation to whom, educated as they were in the more careless and irreverential system, amelioration wears the aspect of innovation. But with the laity the real experiment has yet to be tried. We cannot too often or too forcibly proclaim, that until that generation which was suckled in Church principles from the breast, which has been accustomed to Church ways, Church seasons, solemn services, as the rule and not the exception of their earliest life, becomes not merely adults, but themselves the parents and the instructors of a later generation already growing into intelligent perception; the true vitality, the genuine inrootedness of the Church revival cannot be adequately tested. Each year, as it concludes, brings this crucial season nearer; but it has not yet arrived. The second generation is indeed now stepping on the scene, but the third has hardly yet arisen to prove their parents' sincerity.

It has we know sometimes been said that the 'high' Church fashion has had its day, and that now the 'Broad Church' success is setting in. We entirely demur to this doctrine, for this simple reason, that, although we know of many estimable clergymen



and laymen who are styled Broad Churchmen, we have never yet been fortunate enough to discover a corporate coherence which is to secure success for the Broad Church, either as a party or a doctrinal cause. It will be remembered that the name suddenly sprung up into full-grown currency through that article, more smart than deep, on Church parties, by the late Mr. Conybeare, which appeared a few years since in the *Edinburgh Review*. 'Broad Church' had a ringing sound, and made up the trio cleverly with High and Low, and it accordingly graduated in the language with a rapidity only equalled by that which led the universal public some years before to connect a one-horse chariot with a famous ex-chancellor. In the meanwhile, however, the members of the Broad Church party were gazetted without their leave being asked for, or even thought of. Few indeed protested, if any, and so the new party came into existence on paper, with ranks formidable for the numbers and the ability of the names upon its roster. But if their opinions come to be tested, the infinite variety which at once becomes apparent, shows how impossible it is for the Broad Church ever to become either a cause or a party. To take the latest example, Mr. Maurice's indignation at Mr. Kingsley's supposed obligations to him is eminently suggestive. The High Church cause combines the different sections of its followers in the belief of an apostolic ministry and sacramental grace. Low Churchmen have their Shibboleths. But the definition of a Broad Churchman as such is merely the negative one, that he does not choose to be called either High or Low. There are persons using the name who consider 'Church' as merely an expletive, and in whose eyes 'Broad' is pretty well synonymous with indistinct and undefined,—'Christians unattached,' in short, who have not openly left the Establishment. But it is most unjust to impute this character to Broad Churchmen as a class, for we are convinced that under that vocable are included many men really zealous for the Church cause, and for the *bene esse* of the actual Prayer-book Church, but to whom the name and idea of party, in connexion with religious affairs, is peculiarly offensive, and who accordingly take refuge in an appellation which they consider has come into existence as a protest against the High and the Low Church parties. To such as these we gladly bid 'God speed,' and from their co-operation, whatever be its degree, more or less hearty, more or less complete, we anticipate great good for the cause, which might perhaps have continued unattainable, had they not found a name under which they could work for that cause, without identifying themselves with that Church party in which, from however unfounded suspicions, they were unwilling to enlist. But we shall be asked why we anticipate the possibility of any

special co-operation from the so-called Broad Churchmen, rather than from members of the Low Church party—since, it will be said, you have hoisted the banner of the Church cause, you find yourself in harmony with influential sections of that organization upon many questions on which you and they think alike, and, thinking alike, think diversely from the latitudinarian section of the Broad Church? We grant the latter part of this observation to the uttermost, but we reply, that there is a direct and intentional opposition between the adjectives ‘High’ and ‘Low,’ which does not exist between High and Broad, and that in this opposition consists the difference.

A Broad Churchman may be to any extent neutral or indifferent about what is of the most vital interest to the High Churchman; but he is not necessarily antagonistic; a Low Churchman is *vi termini* an antagonist, in so far as he is Low; and upon the matters in which the distinction between High and Low comes out. Besides, the ‘High’ Churchman only accepts his adjective under a protest, and out of deference to the general weakness. He holds himself to be, and desires others to consider him, *simpliciter* a Churchman. If words have any value, the prefix ‘Low’ applied to Church has a depreciatory value, and so the person who is *simpliciter* a Churchman, can never be actually one with the man who refuses to be a Churchman, except with a depreciatory prefix. It may, indeed, be almost admitted that

‘High Church and Low Church  
Is A Church and No Church.’

There is, however, nothing depreciatory in the prefix ‘Broad,’ nor anything to derogate from the possibility of the man who uses it claiming at another time to be *simpliciter* a Churchman, in a full and genuine acceptance of the term. Neither High nor Broad are of Scriptural authority, and if it had happened, a thing not impossible, that the Puritan party, from its Calvinistic affinities, had taken the name of ‘narrow’ instead of ‘low’ Church, its orthodox opponents would have been termed broad instead of high Churchmen, many generations before the former word actually came into vogue. It is hardly necessary for us to say that we are no apologists for the vagueness of opinion with which many Broad Churchmen, even of the better sort, may be justly charged on matters of importance. We are taking the Church of England as it stands, and while we admit and deplore that vagueness, we may be allowed to believe that in so far as it is not hostile to the precise faith, it is more hopeful and more truthful than the rigid narrow anti-Catholic bigotry which is so often the normal character of the Low Churchman. ‘I hesitate’ may not be a comfortable frame of

mind, but it is many degrees better than, 'I repudiate'—for the Gospel, according to Exeter Hall, may be definite enough when it is most opposed to the Gospel, according to Apostles and Evangelists; and it is, therefore, only reasonable and right to hold out the hand to those who have attained the knowledge of this contrariety, and so assist them towards the firm footing of the ancient faith. Sabbatarianism, psilo-biblist, Solifidianism, contempt for the beautiful in service and in fabric, that study of apocalyptic prophecy, which is perpetually calling, 'Lo here, or lo there,' the undervaluing of the critical study of the original text, and the unconscious substitution of Milton's irreverent figments for the awful and reticent statements of inspiration, are all phases of popular religious error, in opposing which, the Church cause may, without fear or reproach, accept the aid of earnest and reverential broad Churchmen. If these inventions of the anti-sacramental system are once swept away, the bias of positive religion must, humanly speaking, tend towards the faith of the ancient universal Church. As an incidental illustration of the standing of the better portion of the 'broad Church' towards the Church cause, we need not go further than the meeting held at Shrewsbury this autumn, for the unsuccessful purpose of bullying a clergyman who had made some very moderate and cautious ameliorations in his service. At this gathering, the chief defender of the clergyman was found in the person of the learned, able, and high-minded Dr. Kennedy, who, in a speech of noticeable power and honesty, confessed, as a Broad Churchman, no little sympathy with the persecuted clergyman against his Puritan opponents, and gave, as his own opinion, that the 'moderate high Churchmen' were the largest party in the Church of England.

As to the question of comparative numbers, no better test can be applied than the prevalent hue of the Churchmanship of the elective members of Convocation. It might have been speciously urged, that at the general election of 1852, the first really contested election of a real Convocation for nearly a century and a half, the low Church party were caught napping, and in their incredulity as to Convocation ever recovering its voice, allowed their opponents to win the easy guerdon of many sham successes. But when, at the elections of 1857 and of 1859, the high Church majority was steadily maintained in the face of violent exertions on the part of its opponents, the conviction irresistibly grew that the largest number of the clergy of England were high Church, while the further fact, that very few, if any, professed broad Church candidates presented themselves as such, was an evidence that there was, properly speaking, no broad 'party' in action, but that the clergy who called themselves by

that vocable, took the opportunity of protesting against Puritan bigotry by their support of the Church candidates.

We are fully alive to the negative character of the next point, which we propose to pass in favourable review. But the absence of a great disadvantage may, by comparison, be reckoned as a decided advantage. The most damaging feature of the Church revival has unquestionably been that of the secessions to Rome, which, although not more numerous than to be able (as the *Times* with cynical truthfulness lately said) nearly to fill a moderately sized room, have yet periodically aroused the national timidity and suspiciousness to an extent which it would be foolish to depreciate. These secessions were, we grant, very startling. We were startled by them as much as any one else, even the *Record*. But they were the result of causes easy to be explained to those who chose to listen, and in reality they in no way invalidated the genuineness of the Church movement. It was but natural that in a movement from too little to sufficient Church, several people should be unable to put on the break at the right moment, and so should pass on to too much; but the noticeable feature of the Romeward secessions was that all or nearly all of those who were most prominent in their abandonment of High Churchmanship, had earlier in life been prominent for their zeal in the Low Church interest; while of those who had passed into genuine Churchmanship from the old established, or 'high and dry' parties, or from simple indifference, few, if any, were seduced across the boundary.

In confirmation of this assertion we may repeat the observation, that the principal secessions group themselves under two epochs. First is the Newman epoch, comprising in its numbers seceders whose faith had been weakened ever since 1839. The desertion of those persons was ostensibly caused, as we have shown above, by the circumstances in connexion with the Jerusalem Bishopric, Tract 90, and the Ward and Oakeley affairs. The most prominent seceders of this epoch were Messrs. *Newman, Ward, Oakeley, Dalgairns, Faber*, of whom we have italicised all who were originally prominent as Low Churchmen. The second epoch may be denominated the Manning one, and comprehends the seceders who left the Church of England subsequently to the Gorham case and at the time of the Papal aggression. It includes (Low Churchmen being similarly marked) Messrs. *Manning, Dodsworth, R. Wilberforce, H. Wilberforce, Hope-Scott, Allies*, and Maskell. Impressible as the popular mind is by facts, rather than by the reason of those facts, it is not surprising that the public refused to listen to reason on this head, and that the Church cause accordingly suffered heavily by these deplorable events, while every fresh

secession which may occur tends to keep alive the irritation. But we see nothing at present foreboding a movement towards Rome on the part of any section of Churchmen possessing anything like the weight of the Newman or the Manning clique. As to those who occasionally drop off, they go out on their own responsibility, while their act no more invalidates the soundness of our position than the individual aberration of any person injures any cause with which he may be identified.

We say this with the full consciousness of the existence, during the last three years, of a weekly journal, professing Church principles of a strong, not to say extreme tendency, whose intemperate language in denunciation of persons and things in the Church of England, and in praise of the Roman system, has created a very deep feeling of dissatisfaction in those who are most keenly alive to the errors of popular religionism, and most anxious to raise our Church out of their influence. The grounds upon which the paper in question was established were in themselves colourable. It was argued that the excellent journal which has established itself as the organ of Churchmanship sometimes took a politic rather than a theological view of questions, and was occasionally apt to criticise where it ought rather to sympathise. Of course the answer to the first of these reasonings was that theology and journalism did not go well together, and that if an organ of a somewhat technical and *ad clerum* character were needed, it ought to be in a more pamphlet-like form than a weekly paper. As to the second head of the count, even were it occasionally well founded, yet the establishment of a rival sheet was not the most effective remedial process. Still, of the mere fact of a new journal in the interests of the Church cause being set up, nothing worse could be predicated than that its projectors judged unwisely in a worldly point of view. The sudden summersault by which a weekly paper, notorious for its rabid animosity to good Churchmanship, became, by a mere change of heading, the advocate of the High Church cause in its most extreme aspects, might fairly awaken alarms which would not otherwise have existed. Still, the candidate was on its trial, and it was open to it to have disarmed the apprehensions of Churchmen by its ability, wisdom, and moderation. Let those who have ever looked into its pages answer whether the result has been of this favourable character. Much, no doubt, that it says, is what we may agree with in matter, though not always in manner; but there is much about which, both as to matter and manner, we deeply regret, alike for the writers and the readers of the paper, that it should ever have been allowed to see the light. Had its most startling diatribes or most disturbing investigations been graced either

with originality of thought or vigour of language, we should have, while not the less lamenting the existence of so damaging an advocate of the Church cause, have owned its claims upon the respectful consideration of the polemical world. But when, week after week, we are satiated with a cold hash-up of the opinions of the later British critics, the apologists for Tract 90, the biographers of the 'British Saints,' and the idealist of the Christian Church, in language weakly flatulent and forcibly feeble, without one scintilla of the wit, the picturesqueness, and the logic of the able men who had in their days possessed the unhappy privilege of disorganizing the Church party and damping the Church cause, we can only pray that the conductors of the paper may as speedily as possible be brought to the conviction that the best service they can render to the Church is to disband their corps, and leave the *ci-devant Church and State Gazette* to debase from natural decay of forces. But if they continue to make the Vestment question the *articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ*, to identify its success or failure with that of sacramental doctrine itself, to reiterate their flippant and irreverent vocabulary of slang, 'table prayers,' and so forth, to endeavour to re-open the breach between 'old' and 'new' High Churchmen, and to prop their arguments with stories as preposterous as that which on one occasion headed the principal leading article,—of an old woman of the past generation, who was in the habit of attending early morning prayers at York Minster, and who, happening one day to go rather earlier than usual, was rewarded by the vision of some future restoration of all the elaborate pomp of mediæval worship, about which she knew as much as the verger,—we shall be compelled more strongly and more emphatically than we do at present to call upon Churchmen to repudiate an organ so thoroughly puerile and detrimental.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> We may be allowed to refer to a particular instance of the *Union's* polemics in regard to an individual. Mr. Beresford Hope, who was a candidate for the University of Cambridge in the early part of last year, received a letter from one of his supporters, the Rev. E. Perowne, relative to his connexion with the ritualism of All Saints' Church, Margaret Street. Mr. Beresford Hope, in his reply, briefly repudiated any connexion with that particular ritualism, and—stating that he had never been inside the then temporary church (which he forgot to explain had been used since 1854) from the dissatisfaction which he had felt with the ritualism employed in its predecessors—informed his correspondent that his connexion with the new church of All Saints' was 'purely architectural,' and that, desirous as he was to see 'art in its noblest and purest forms adapted to the worship of the Most High,' he yet disapproved of the system of 'minute observances' which had grown into use in 'that locality,' (i.e. the successive temporary chapels as far as he was acquainted with them,) to which he applied the term 'Romanist' apparently in reference to its minuteness, and not to any grandeur or artistic beauty which they possessed, as was proved by his expressed wish, to render such ultra-ritualism in the new church 'as impossible' as he could, while



Still we do not compliment the paper, written in though it be, and belauded by Romanists, by any fear that it betokens a revival of the days of 1845, or of 1851. As we have said, stragglers will continue to drop off, but we trust and hope that the mass (if mass there be) of those who approve of that paper's polemics, will be no more dazzled by its puny scintillations than they were by the mightier blaze of a Newman's logic or a Manning's rhetoric. There is many a man who in the fervour of his youth used to boast that he would stop in the Church of England as long as, but no longer than Mr. Newman or Archdeacon Manning, who is now by divine grace cheerfully and hopefully labouring in its vineyard. We trust and we believe the same of the readers of that unfortunate ephemeral.

*Quorsum hæc?* We have been dwelling upon considerations external to the *causa causalis* of the Church 'cause.' Why is it a 'cause?'—what has it caused? We are prepared to answer this most reasonable interrogatory. The Church cause exists, not to create the Catholic faith, *quod semper quod ubique quod ab omnibus est creditum*, but to produce in the Anglican communion, which it acknowledges as belonging to the unity of that Catholic Faith, the fruit worthy of such a tree. Upon the doctrinal growth, and the wounds which that growth has received in the house of friends, we are not willing to dilate. We believe that the damage incident on an individual doctrinal defeat may sometimes be less detrimental to the immediate well-being of

striving after 'architectural and artistic beauty,'—how?—'by the simplicity and dignity of the arrangements.' We are not now concerned to investigate how far Mr. Beresford Hope was justified in his unfavourable judgment of the 'ultra-ritualism' employed in 'that locality.' The *Union* had a perfect right, if it pleased, to contest that point; but we conclude he spoke the truth when he said that he had never been inside the last temporary chapel, and therefore, that (a natural *sequitur* surely) his connexion with the particular church of All Saints' was 'purely architectural,' and that he had 'never identified' himself with the 'system,' explaining as he further did, that 'the splendid munificence of friends' had 'entrusted to him the administration of their gifts,' thus manifestly depriving him of any option of retiring from the work, whether or not he could still follow it up with perfect confidence in its successful results, other than artistic. He said absolutely nothing, one way or the other, for he was asked nothing, about his general views on ritualism, except what might be inferentially but reasonably gleaned from the sentences, speaking in reference to the new church, of 'art in its noblest and purest forms adapted to the worship of the Most High,' 'artistic model,' 'architectural and artistic beauty,' and 'simplicity and dignity of arrangements.' What interpretation, however, has the *Union*, sometimes in its editorial columns, sometimes in the correspondence which it admits, persistently affixed to this letter? The flagrantly unfair and unfounded one, that Mr. Beresford Hope repudiated his known taste for ecclesiology, and condescended to pretend that all he had anywhere done in its behalf was simply for the gratification of an architectural *penchant*; and that (for the *Union* does not scruple to make this further insinuation) with this pretended repudiation of ecclesiology, Mr. Beresford Hope confessed himself unfaithful to the Church cause in doctrine as well as in ritual. We leave to our readers to say whether such misrepresentations are within the limits of fair polemics.

the cause than one upon a matter of secondary import in its dogmatic signification. The latter generally alters or deteriorates something materially existing, and is, in proportion to that alteration or deterioration, materially obnoxious. The action of the former during the abeyance of any collective voice, legislative or judicial, of the Anglican communion competent to speak *ex cathedra*, must be more or less personal and extramaterial in its action, and therefore admits of being virtually minimised in proportion as it is accepted partially and with a bad grace—while, at the worst, it merely adds a chapter to that record of trials which exists to try and to prove the practical faith of English Churchmen. The Gorham judgment insulted their holiest feelings, and they let the depth of the insult be known. The result is that the intelligent comprehension of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and the conviction that the Prayer-book teaches that doctrine and nothing else, is probably far stronger at this day than it was ten years ago. This, we believe, will prove to be the result of controversies, greatly as their agitation is to be deplored and deprecated, upon the doctrine of the Eucharist. On the contrary, disputes upon secondary questions may often result in the *main forte* being then and there summarily laid upon something which it might be very desirable to preserve, without any compensating advantage in return for the privation.

Practically, the signs of hope and vitality among us are both numerous and weighty. The extension of the colonial Church, its bishoprics where presbyterates barely existed a few years since, its synods of clergy and laity joined in harmonious concert, its cathedrals replacing proprietary chapels, its colleges rising in every direction, its missions to the heathen, ending with the hopeful Central African one, with which the Senate-House of Cambridge so lately rang, would require pages upon pages to exhaust their significance. Suffice it to say, that in the colonies that lie between the eastern shores of Labrador and Newfoundland and the mouth of the Columbia river, in the West Indian groups, in the great new world of civilization growing into being in South Africa, in the almost continent of Australia and the large islands of Tasmania and New Zealand, in the Polynesian and Melanesian groups,—in India, too, to a more partial extent,—and finally, in that vigorous 'Protestant Episcopal' community, which, existing as it does in the numerous States of the American Union, presents so many points of resemblance to our own colonial Church—we see growing into shape, with features in the main distinctly Church-like, a vast and energetic development of religious life, founded in the doctrines of Episcopacy, and on the sacramental system of the

English Prayer-book—a development of which the first seeds were sown in the very lifetime of the fathers and the mothers of those who are still in active middle life.<sup>1</sup>

We have already dwelt upon the Church form of the instinct for collective self-government, now rife among us, and we pass on to the actual manifestations of vigour apparent in the educational and the devotional phases of the Church of England. The old universities will not detain us long. We believe that, substantially, the Church cause will be found to be holding its ground in both of them, although the first excitement and fervour of the movement having passed away, the Church party does not fill so conspicuous a space in the eye of the critical by-stander.<sup>2</sup> The triumph of the Church cause, shown in education, is to be mainly sought, as far as the higher and middle classes are concerned, in the improvement of our ancient public schools, and in the numerous new institutions of a collegiate character springing up on every side. If Eton be compared to what it was in the days of George III., we venture to say that the revolution of a century crammed into less than half that space, would be a faint description of the change. Harrow under Dr. Wordsworth reared its chapel: under Dr. Vaughan that chapel, sumptuously rebuilt, exhibits to successive generations of pupils a noble specimen of the beauty of holiness in the English Church. But why take our public schools one by one? Each would furnish some pregnant example of our proposition, and the fact that the first great reformer of the Anglican public schools was the man who perhaps gave utterance to the most gravely severe words ever employed against the rising Church party, Dr. Arnold, proves how much the Church cause may draw succour from every soil through which the healthy rain of heaven percolates. The new collegiate creations of the last twenty years are a living monument of the zeal of one generation. Although its establishment dates a little before the date we have selected, Durham University deserves first notice. Diocesan colleges, as at Wells, Chichester, Cuddesdon, Lichfield, are a class of institutions previously unknown, and the missionary abbey of England, restored as its missionary college, should not be forgotten. S. Peter's, Radley, and its model, S. Columba's, in Ireland, and Trinity College, Perthshire, are whole-hearted

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Routh was one of those who advised Bishop Seabury to seek consecration in Scotland, and Bishop White, whose consecration at Lambeth so soon followed Seabury's courageous plunge, died only two years before the accession of the Queen.

<sup>2</sup> The cheer with which the undergraduates welcomed the Bishop of Oxford's fearless enunciation of the Apostolical Succession at the Cambridge meeting, was noticed by many persons as a remarkable proof of the present strength of the Church cause.

endeavours to create new Church-like and public schools upon the old models reformed; and of a larger scope than either, Mr. Woodard's vast scheme of public schools, to embrace within the Church system, and under one administration, all classes of society in all quarters of the kingdom, has made a splendid commencement in its 'upper-middle' class college of S. John at Hurstpierpoint and its gentle college of S. Nicolas at Lancing; while a third college, for the 'lower-middle' class, is already on foot at Shoreham; in another part of the same county of Sussex, and under cognate influence, collegiate education for girls is being attempted at S. Michael's House, Bognor. S. Andrew's College, at Bradfield, is a worthy rival to Radley, and S. Michael's College, Tenbury, cannot be unnoticed. The Clergy Orphan School has, with its removal to Canterbury, assumed a collegiate character. Such institutions as the New Medical Benevolent College own, we believe, their connexion with the Church. Training colleges for school-masters and mistresses—S. Mark's, Whitelands, Culham, Fishponds, &c. &c.—are gradually diffusing a healthy influence felt over the land; while the extension of parochial schools, in which Prayer-book religion forms the staple of teaching, is of course commensurate with that of churches and clergymen zealous in the Church cause. That cause, in a word, has struck deep into the educational system of the higher and of the lower classes. Its weak point still is the possession of the middle ground. The education of that growingly important class, those engaged in or dependent on retail commerce, and the cognate professions of mercantile clerks, and so forth, is still for the most part conducted in wretched private 'commercial schools,' where either no religion, or the most unsatisfactory kind of popular Protestantism is taught. All thinking men of right views acknowledge the deficiency, but no one, except Mr. Woodard, has yet had the courage to attempt a remedy on a large scale. In the meanwhile, palliatives from the low and the latitudinarian schools are presented; and in the growth of that well-intentioned but narrow and ill-instructed fraternity, the 'Christian Young Men,' much social inconvenience, as the *Saturday Review* not long since well pointed out, may be anticipated.

If we now turn to the devotional life of the Church, we shall find abundant cause for thankfulness and hope. Model services, in the rigid sense of the word, may yet be counted off in a small list. But the growth of correct Church building and restoration is such as to surprise the most sanguine of those who took an early part in the 'ecclesiological' movement; the relative standard is raised, irrespective of party; and it is sheer perversity alone which can dissuade even the Low Churchman

from imparting much that is solemn, æsthetic, and ecclesiastical, into the fabrics he raises. The *Ecclesiologist* for October contains, for example, the description of the professed 'low Church,' S. Simon's, Chelsea, which, however unsatisfactory and grotesque architecturally, is yet decidedly ecclesiastical in its spirit. Our cathedrals, witness Ely, Lichfield, Chichester, Peterborough, Oxford, Hereford, Carlisle, have, with more or less success, taken the lead in the restoration movement, and the number of parish churches which follow in their wake exempts us from any liability to quote examples. In the Established Church of Ireland (which already boasted the grandiose restoration at Armagh) a new cathedral, small, but strictly Churchlike in its appointments, is rising at Kilmore. The crowds that thronged All Saints', Margaret Street, during the last season, were a proof that it is not substantial beauty, nor sumptuousness, nor dignity, at which the popular mind is apt to take umbrage. The gorgeous structure at Haley Hill, near Halifax, built by that noble-hearted manufacturer, Mr. Akroyd, a former 'Liberal' M.P., and a convert by conviction to the Church, with its painted glass, its statues of scriptural and bas-reliefs of primitive saints, its mural paintings, its stalled chancel, its reredos with the cross flanked by the effigies of the assistants at the Divine Passion, opened with the general jubilation of a manufacturing town, and consecrated with expressions of warm praise by a prelate so little compromised to high Churchmanship as the present Bishop of Ripon, is a striking lesson how far the cause has succeeded in making good its footing. The love for choral services is every day increasing, and the aversion to them dying away. The anti-pew crusade, the symbolizing that is of the communion of saints in the arrangements of our churches, is now no longer any badge of party, but enlists the active co-operation of persons calling themselves Churchmen, of every hue of opinion. A quarter of a century back, our cathedrals were perhaps among the most unpopular of national institutions; they seemed to have been saved till then merely to be led to the sacrifice, amid the plaudits of a hostile people. Now they are, if anything, in danger of over-popularity. The greedy attempt of the Low Church party to steal a march in Exeter Hall, met by Mr. Edouart's perhaps too rigid line of opposition, has resulted in creating the *furor* not for cathedrals only and the cathedral chapters, but actually for choral services celebrated in those cathedrals by crowds of surpliced choirmen. We were not so much younger than we are now when the plea urged in these and cognate pages for using the cathedral naves was reckoned among the wildest of youthful dreams. In 1860 who dare to wag a tongue against the proposition?

Finally, the highest court of appeal has actually, now, gravely sanctioned a system of Church observance, which, however much it might have been before the judgment of 1857 esteemed by sensible men to be both lawful and right, could yet not point, as it now does, to any definite and clear decision of modern times given in its favour. We are not willing to reopen the vicissitudes of that controversy. We are now legally entitled to use, and we do use, the cross in close superposition to the altar, we clothe that altar with carpets varying according to the Christian season; we place the candles on it; we erect the table of prothesis hard by for the solemn offering; we fence the chancel with cancelli, we crown them, if occasion permits, with the cross of Christ. With such privileges, so deliberately granted to us by so grave and dispassionate a tribunal as the Judicial Committee, we should be well content.

Against such a weight of corporate success, it would be idle to allege that partial discomfiture, or any exhibition however disgusting and brutal of an antagonistic spirit, ought to afford us grounds for yielding to faintheartedness. We should, for example, not be inclined to note the miserable proceedings at S. George's-in-the-East, as any serious blow to the 'Church' cause. Words would, indeed, fail us to describe the loathing and indignation which we feel at the profanity, the ribaldry, and the sacrilege and blasphemy of those saturnalia of all evil, those witch sabbaths, which were for so many Sundays enacted in the Church of S. George's-in-the-East. That the authorities did their duty, as they might have done, in repressing them, we deny. That the public testified as it ought to do, their sense of the national shame involved, we refuse to admit. Palliation there was absolutely none for the offence. 'Oh, but the rioters were non-parishioners, and were merely drawn there by the love of excitement.' Very well then, we answer, so much the worse for the condition of the public peace in the Tower Hamlets, which permits those hordes of barbarians to convert the Lord's house into a fighting-ground, and the Lord's day into a bacchanalian orgy. But supposing the rioters were parishioners, would it have mended the matter? He would be a bold man that, with the slightest knowledge of what the parish of S. George's-in-the-East really is, would dare give an affirmative answer. A more appalling sight than the cosmopolitan ruffianism, the flaunting harlotry of Ratcliffe Highway, on a Sunday, cannot be witnessed. In plain English, the parish is simply a *colluvies gentium*, the nautical quarter of a great commercial city. The idea that this mob cared for or knew the difference between a chasuble and a box-coat is utterly ridiculous to suppose; but even if there were any colourable connexion between the disturbances and the vestments



which Mr. Bryan King had adopted, his abandonment of them at the Bishop of London's instance has cut away this miserable pretext. In short, the whole disturbance is clearly traceable to the party dodge of setting up Mr. Hugh Allen, under an unfortunate Act of Parliament, as co-incumbent. For many years Mr. Bryan King had gone on with his choral services, and for a long time with his vestments. He had emptied the Church, but he kept the peace. Mr. Allen, a specimen of the popular clerical agitator, came, and then Club-law reigned. It suited the newspapers to take up the case in the dull season, but when they had used it sufficiently, as might be supposed, they turned round and pooh-poohed the whole affair.

Still, we should not be acting honestly if we professed to think that Mr. King was well advised in his restoration of the vestments. As to their perfect legality we have no doubt. The rubric plainly declares it, and that rubric received an authoritative interpretation by the Privy Council judgment of 1857, while their use has been maintained by the custom of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Dean of Westminster, &c. wearing their copes at ceremonials of high state import. Neither can Popery be reasonably imputed to a garment which is in constant use in the Protestant communities of Scandinavia and of much of North Germany, together with crucifixes on the altars, as the Evangelical Alliance found out to its consternation at Berlin, when shown into a church so fitted as their place of sitting. Still, the reassumption in our Church of vestments of which the very name had faded out of the mind, must be treated as a question, not of strict law, but of policy, unless indeed we are prepared to say that every celebrating priest is bound, irrespective of consequences, and without delay, to assume his chasuble. Well, then, as a question of policy and not of strict law, was Mr. King well advised when he did so? We doubt it, not so much on account of the rioting which has been the characteristic of S. George's this year, as of the apathy which seems to have been its normal condition for a long time previously. The Church revival owes its strength to the fact that it carried with it a popular feeling, not always a *majority* popular feeling, but a feeling sufficient in almost every locality to rally round the clergyman a knot of sincere and courageous friends, and in cases like those of S. Mary Magdalene, S. Barnabas, S. Peter's at Leeds, Kidderminster, S. Ninian's at Perth, &c. &c., to create crowded and enthusiastic congregations. To this feeling we owe (to quote the latest instance) the Church at Halifax, to which we have recently referred. Such being the case, it becomes our duty to ascertain what portions of the *ideal* 'Catholic system' seem to have made good their hold of the

popular feeling in the nineteenth century in England, and what have not. We think we shall have little difficulty in perceiving that architecture and constructive ritualism have won the day; that the cause of iconography on wall, or canvas, or window, or embodied in sculptured stone, has triumphed; that choral services with the accompaniment of surpliced choirs are becoming every day more common, and more approved by the public mind. To foster and to encourage all these gains upon Puritanism, is surely enough for at least one generation. On the contrary, after about a quarter of a century's existence of the ecclesiological movement, the revival of vestments can still at the best muster but a scanty and archæological following. It may be intensely illogical that aristocratic and polished England cannot tolerate ceremonial which is the daily food of rude and democratised Norway. But such things do not go by logic; and we think that the clergyman, whether in London or in the country, who would risk the success of a church—catholic in its architecture and appointments, frequent celebrations, and constant choral surpliced services—for a chasuble, would be more bold than wise. The vestment revival has about it the unlucky feature that—most unjustly we own and unfairly, but still colourably—it is open like nothing else to the charge of self-seeking, inasmuch as the object ornamented is not the building or the service, but the actual person of the officiator. Thence perhaps its non-popularity. But without analyzing the question further, we strongly advise our friends to rest content with the implicit connexion with all other branches—Greek, Roman, and (assumedly) Swedish—of the Universal Church, which the theoretical legality of the vestments gives, and to labour in those other fields of ecclesiological revival which are obviously such as bear the stamp of possibility and popularity in the amount of general sympathy they have already won. When every church in England has its stalled chancel, duly filled with its surpliced choir, when every church has at least its weekly celebration, at its altar duly surmounted (we are not too nice in asking in what form or material) with the emblem of salvation,—then, and not till then, we may enter into inquiries which are now premature.

We are aware that we are open to the retort, that had similar counsels of prudence existed in the earliest days of ecclesiology, no ground might have been secured. But this retort blinks the real point at issue. At first starting ecclesiology was, of course, daring, as much as it was tentative. The experience of more than twenty years has changed its experimental character into that of a cause which has gathered its own experience upon which to form its own conclusions.

What we have argued is the conclusion in our own minds of that experience.

The Church has equally displayed its revived force in its aspect of the consoler. Need we advert to the Penitentiary movement, that blessed work of the saintly Bishop Armstrong? We only wish that other institutions of charity, intended not for the refuge and reformation of the fallen, but for the protection of the innocent—institutions like the House of Charity, in Rose Street, Soho, had equally flourished. It was well to have met the pressing need of penitentiaries, but it was not so well to have directed a too exclusive zeal to this one work. The Sisters of Mercy movement has indeed attracted considerable attention, and drawn into its system ardent self-sacrificing souls, but somehow it has not made the progress which wants such as those which it is intended to meet would apparently have opened out. We fear that it may perhaps have been started without enough attention having been directed towards blending it with things as they are at the present day. Perhaps also it was somewhat inverting the course of nature to suppose that women would learn to live in community in the Church of England before some system of corporate living and action for men suitable to present circumstances had been devised. Some Mission Colleges, such as S. Paul's, Soho, have been created, but the number is still very small, and from various circumstances neither S. Saviour's, Leeds, nor All Saints', Margaret Street, now exhibit that character as their founders desired. Besides, while England is studded in its almost every town and many a village with almshouses and such foundations—the majority of them the creation of a strong religious movement in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and early eighteenth centuries, but with a considerable sprinkling of ante-reformatory date—many of them possessing their chapels and rules of public worship according to the Church system, no adequate attempt on the part of Churchmen has been made to breathe life into these dry bones, while the 'Reformatory' movement has been suffered to assume a complexion of very mitigated Churchmanship.

With so cheering a roll to refer to of the successes, not indeed unchequered, but still numerous and decisive, of the Church 'cause,' we may be asked, why then do we regret the abeyance of the Church 'party'? Is not a 'cause' a grander and a more sacred thing than any 'party'? Assuredly it is; but yet we earnestly wish that the Church party could have kept better united, not for partizan and factious objects, but in order to promote that cause, in order, if need were, to check any partizan feeling among Churchmen which might have threatened, in the interests of clique (that caricature of party), to postpone

the welfare of the cause itself. Man, gregarious creature as he is, must, by the law of his being, act in all public matters according to some system of parties, great or small. If these parties are great, they can act in a large hearted spirit; if they are small, they become cliques. In this inaction of the Church party the Church cause has been served by Church cliques, and numerous isolated fields of activity, not strictly coming under the heads of synodical action, missionary work, education, devotion, or consolation, have been opened out. So far so good. Organizations like Mr. Meyrick's excellent and active Anglo-Continental Society, and the no less admirable Anglo-American Society, of which Dr. Caswall and Mr. Dickinson are the chief managers, for passing English emigrants to the United States safe into the hands of the American Church, not to mention Lord John Manners' long-established Tithe Redemption Trust, are of unmitigated benefit. But elsewhere, in various quarters, the spirit of clique, we fear, dissipates strength which, with a vigilant and united Church party under arms, would have been concentrated towards winning still more solid successes for the Church cause. It is not too late for the Church party again to rally; and we say to it, 'Rally, but do so with wisdom, and above all things be sure of the leaders whom you select.' Churchmen were caught asleep when the agitation for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister was revived. Happily, not too late, a machinery, specially meant to oppose this mischief, has been constructed; and, still more happily, it includes among its workers men prominent in the councils of the 'Low' no less than those of the 'High' Church side, while it is headed by Dean Trench, a man eminently calculated to conciliate their varying interests. Upon such a co-operation for such a cause we cannot but earnestly pray for the divine blessing. Still it was no credit to the Church party that it happened to be at the time without sufficient organization satisfactorily to resist the aggression.

Again: the agitation which has recently sprung up under the lead of the impulsive Lord Ebury, to expunge Church doctrine from the Prayer-Book—(we like calling a spade a spade)—ought to have been met at its first outset by the collective voice of some body representing the Church party. If ever Churchmen had reason to see their want of wisdom in having allowed the London Church Union to fall into inactivity, it was upon the occasion of the anti-Prayer-Book movement. That that movement will be frustrated by a collective opposition to it, we have not the slightest doubt; such has already been started; but we assert, it would have been more quickly and more effectually quelled if the Church party had not broken up

its phalanx. That it should be put down is, humanly speaking, a matter of life and death to the Church cause; for with the excision of the Catholic Faith from the Prayer-Book we may safely say that the life if not the essence of a Church would have departed from our Establishment. Excision of the Catholic Faith may sound a strong term, but we refuse to apply any milder language to the mutilations which those friends of Lord Ebury, whose petition he has thought proper to commit to the especial notice of the London Churchwardens, desire to inflict upon the Baptismal and other Services, and to the omission of the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick. By the side of such a conflict as this, any dispute about temporalities might seem a small matter; but the attitude which the 'Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Control' has assumed with respect to Church-rates has totally altered the complexion of the Church-rate question. It is now no longer denied that these are merely the *cheval de bataille* for an onslaught on the Church itself, as an object of hatred alike in its spiritual and its social character to that society, and the society must accordingly be resisted to the utmost. Its impudent 'Endowed School Bill' is another proof of its real object, though, in this case, the very coarseness of the assault caused its defeat for the time being. The Church may well and reasonably consider what concessions it can make to the individual consciences of genuine Dissenters, while declining to give the Dissenters so relieved any further voice in Church affairs; but to surrender Church-rates at the dictum of the Liberation Society would be to do something far worse than merely abandoning an ancient right, and a material possession, out of cowardice or false love of popularity.

Here is work enough of the defensive sort for a Church 'party'—the maintenance of the residue of our marriage law, the defence of the Prayer-book, the foiling of the 'Liberation' conspiracy. But there is more behind which ought not to be neglected. Who is to watch—if watching is all that is left to us—lest public morality should be utterly sapped by the pernicious working of the nefarious and execrable Divorce Act—who is ready to sound the alarm if that Act should be still further extended? Then there are the perils from weak brethren—the oppositions of Puritanism and latitudinarianism—the nerveless, colourless, unreliable character of 'young men' religion—the fanaticism of Cummingism and Spurgeonism, and below all the fathomless abyss of infidelity. We pass over trials of the faith like those in Scotland. Will the Church cause ever triumph over these? will it ever win the other Apostolic communities of the world from their presumptuous additions to the one Faith,

and link them in a visible unity? Who can answer? If the Church cause lives—and live we believe it will do—this life is enough for men to hope for, though not enough to pray for.

‘Thy kingdom come’ is our prayer; but when will it come? ‘When the Son of Man comes, shall He find faith upon the earth?’ Most of us, probably all, when we were younger, dreamed of a bright conclusion to the Church movement—the whole Church purified and re-united—the patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, and Canterbury worshipping at the same altar—separatists flocking in by shoals to the one true Church. Happy dreams! But nowhere did we read of them in Scripture. Union indeed and purity there are to be, but they will be found in the New Jerusalem, with new heavens and a new earth. To cherish such imaginations, still more to anticipate with the slightest expectation that they could come to pass in our own day, was perhaps a thought of presumption more akin than we should willingly acknowledge to that widely spread delusion which opens the Apocalypse to trace the politics of the passing hour. To rejoice when the cause is triumphant, to mourn when it is depressed, to do daily and hourly battle against its foes, to be charitable and moderate in success, to be bold and cheerful under reverses; this is, we believe, for many a long year, the vocation of the living soldier of the Church cause. He will never, we believe, see upon earth that which he once anticipated—the ‘angel face’ of visible unity; but its symbol and its ideal should ever be before his mind, and thus will he descry,

‘Wet with the mists, and smitten by the lights,  
The Dragon of the Great Pendragonship  
Blaze, making all the night a steam of fire.’

The mists are heavy, and the night lowers, but the emblem of Christianity, of conscience, of settled rule and high morality, ‘the Dragon of the Great Pendragonship,’ still blazes heavenward.

---



ART. IV.—1. *Missale Ambrosianum, novissime* JOSEPH CARDINALIS PUTEOBONELLI, *Archiepiscopi, auctoritate recognitum*. Mediolani: 1768. Typis Joannis Baptistæ de Sirturis. Impress. Archiepiscopal.

2. *Missale Ambrosianum*, CAROLI CAJETANI CARDINALIS DE GAISRUCK, *Archiepiscopi, auctoritate recognitum*. Novissime impressum. Mediolani: Apud Jacobum Agnelli, Typographum Archiepiscopalem.

THE reader is asked, at the outset, to regard the present paper as the third of a series. In the first, we endeavoured to elucidate the theory of the Roman Liturgy; in the second, we entered at some length into the Mozarabic and Gallican Missal; and in the present, we propose to do as much for the Ambrosian. Some questions, which have been previously discussed at length, we shall therefore feel ourselves at liberty here to consider settled; and it will be our endeavour to avoid repeating now what we have investigated before.

The Ambrosian, like the Mozarabic and Gallican, is a branch of the Ephesine family. All three have been moulded by contact with the Petrine Liturgy; but the Ambrosian, as it might be expected, most of all. It is a living rite, theoretically co-extensive with the province of Milan,—and in this respect of far greater importance than the Mozarabic, now confined to the Chapel in Toledo, and to the three other parishes where it is authorised. But in every other point of view, it is immeasurably inferior to the Spanish Rite; and had the Gallican existed long enough to have taken a status of development like her two sisters, we believe that she also would have been superior to the Milanese. We say, theoretically co-extensive with the province of Milan, because, in point of fact, in the Swiss portion of it, the Roman Rite is used and clung to with marvellous tenacity; insomuch that when Cardinal de Gaisruck endeavoured to substitute the Ambrosian Liturgy, the popular outburst of feeling exclaimed, '*Either Romans or Lutherans!*'

First, we will give a hasty sketch of the fortunes of the Church of Milan during those centuries in which her ritual was assuming its present form; then explain the division of its ecclesiastical year; the framework of its Missæ; and then its particular beauties and defects as compared with the cognate Mozarabic or Gallican forms.

Italy, then, in the earliest ages, was divided into the Roman

and Italic provinces, under the respective headships of Rome and Milan. During the era of persecution, it may safely be said that these two were much on a par: after that period, the one was continually weakened by abstracted provinces, the other continually augmented by means, the recital of which forms one great part of Church History. At an uncertain time, but about A.D. 400, Aquileia became independent of Milan, and vindicated to itself the Primacy of Venetia and Istria. In A.D. 447, the See of Ravenna in like manner claimed the Primacy of the Flaminia and part of the Æmilia; and by these two losses the See of S. Ambrose lost much of the dignity that it had enjoyed previously to and during the pontificate of that great Father.

During his Episcopate, we find the difference between the Roman and Milanese uses, more particularly in the observance of the Saturday, very striking. Yet probably the ritual which he left was the mere kernel or nucleus of that now called the Ambrosian. It was, on the whole, more like the Eastern formulæ than was the Roman; at the same time, in one particular, the variety and distinctions of its Prefaces or Illations, it was further removed from the immutability of the Antiochene and Thaddean families. An interesting article might be written on the traces which remain in the genuine works of S. Ambrose of the Liturgy which existed at his time.

S. Simplician, his successor (A.D. 397—400), is said to have made considerable additions to the formulæ then in use: this may be true; but the very short period of his pontificate must have cramped his designs. It is better to assume that during the whole of the First Epoch of the Post-Ambrosian Church—that which preceded the capture of Milan by Attila (A.D. 397—452)—the Liturgy was more and more assuming completeness, and settling into the definite arrangement of the various Missal Antiphons. Great names ruled the Italic province during that period: S. Venerius for eight years; S. Marolus for fifteen; S. Martinianus for thirteen; S. Glycerius for three; S. Lazarus for eleven; S. Eusebius for fourteen. During the pontificate of the last-named Bishop it was, that the ‘Scourge of GOD,’ having already devastated Northern Italy, fell, in A.D. 452, on Milan. The Bishop, guessing by natural prudence, or forewarned by supernatural agency of the impending ruin, led his flock towards the Maritime and Cottian Alps; and on their return, when Attila had retreated, that restoration of the Great Basilic, better known by the name of *Intramurana*, took place, which has left its stamp on the Ambrosian Calendar to all ages. The great flaw of the Mozarabic, as every one knows, is that beyond the Seventh Sunday after Trinity there is no further Dominical Office till we come to the Kalends of November; so that for

ten or twelve Sundays in the summer the same office is repeated again and again. This would have been the case at Milan; but the time is now well filled up by the occurrence of the Feast of Dedication on the third Sunday in October; the two former Sundays of that month being taken up in preparation for it: and, by the observance of the Decollation of S. John Baptist, with its train of following Sundays.

We are inclined, then, to fix the end of the First Epoch of the Ambrosian Rite to the return of the exiled citizens in 453. The homily delivered on that occasion by the most celebrated preacher of his time, S. Maximus of Turin, and which is still extant, used to be read on the occasion of this Festival, till the last restoration of the Great Basilic, by S. Charles Borromeo.

During the Second Epoch, from thence to the inauguration of the Gothic kings (A.D. 453—493), the Ambrosian Office probably perfected its most important parts. From a careful examination of its Prefaces, and a comparison between them and the relics of ecclesiastical writers of that place and time, this fact, we think, might be made pretty clear; and it is curious that the scholars of Italy have not devoted themselves to an inquiry so full of interest and importance. During this epoch, five Prelates held the See of S. Ambrose; all of them reckoned among the saints—S. Geruntius, S. Benignus, S. Senator, S. Theodorus I., S. Laurentius I.

The Third Epoch is under the Gothic kings, and lasts from A.D. 493 to 568. It also saw five Pontificates, four Prelates out of the five being saints—S. Eustorgius II., S. Magnus, S. Datus, Vitalis, S. Auxanus. During this epoch, the lesser hymns and lections, the Psalmelli, Epistolellæ, Offertories, Transitories, and Confractories, appear to have formed themselves as they now are.

The Fourth Epoch is that of the Lombardic kings, from A.D. 568 to 739; and it is ecclesiastically important from the Aquileian schism of the Three Chapters. The reader is aware that on the condemnation of these Chapters, in the teeth of the Pope, by the Fifth Œcumenical Council, the Primate of Aquileia headed the dissentients from that condemnation; and, taking to himself the title of Patriarch, dealt his anathemas about pretty freely to the rest of the Church.

The schism thus commenced lasted more than a century. During this time the See of Milan was occupied by twelve prelates, of whom seven only are reckoned among the saints; namely, S. Honoratus, Laurentius II., Constantius, Adeodatus, Asterius, Fortis, S. Joannes Bonus, S. Antoninus, S. Mauricillus, S. Ampellius, S. Mansuetus, S. Benedictus, Theodorus II. And in this time we may fairly conclude that the book finally assumed the general character that it now possesses.

We will now proceed to the Office itself; and it will be most convenient to give, in the first place, the Dominical arrangement of its ecclesiastical year, which is very peculiar. The reader will perhaps understand it better if we take an actual year,—that on which we have just entered.

Jan.	1. Circumcision.		17. Third Sun. after Pent.
	8. First Sunday after Epiphany.	July	24. Fourth "
	15. Second "		1. Fifth "
	22. Third "		8. Sixth "
	29. Fourth "		15. Seventh "
Feb.	5. Septuagesima.		22. Eighth "
	12. Sexagesima.	August	29. Ninth "
	19. Quinquagesima.		5. Tenth "
	20. Lent begins.		12. Eleventh "
	26. Quadragesima.		19. Twelfth "
March	4. Sunday of the Samaritan.	Sept.	26. Thirteenth "
	11. " Abraham.		2. First after Decollation.
	18. " The Blind Man.		9. Second "
	25. " Lazarus.		16. Third "
	31. Saturday of the Tradition of the Symbol.		23. Fourth "
April	1. Palm Sunday.	Oct.	30. Fifth "
	8. Easter Day.		7. First Sunday in October.
	15. First Sunday after Easter.		14. Sunday before Dedication.
	22. Second "		21. Dedication.
	29. Third "		28. First Sunday after Dedication.
May	6. Fourth "	Nov.	4. Second "
	13. Fifth "		11. Third "
	17. Ascension Day.		18. First Sunday in Advent.
	20. Sunday after Ascension.		25. Second "
	27. Whitsunday.	Dec.	2. Third "
June	3. Trinity Sunday.		9. Fourth "
	10. Second Sunday after Pentecost.		16. Fifth "
			23. Sixth "

We will next give a table of the analogous changeable portions of the Ambrosian, Mozarabic, and Roman Missals; we shall thus be in a condition to judge of the respective beauties of each.

AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.	ROMAN.
1. Ingressa.	1. Ad Missam Officium.	1. Introitus.
2. Oratio super populum.	2. Oratio.	2. Oratio. <i>Collect for the Day.</i>
3. Prophetia.	3. Prophetia.	
4. Psalmellus.	4. Psallendo.	
5. Epistola.	5. Epistola.	5. Epistola.
6. Canticum.	6. <i>Sometimes</i> Tractus.	6. Graduale, <i>sometimes</i> Sequentia.
7. Evangelium.	7. Evangelium.	7. Evangelium.
8. Antiphona post Evangelium.	8. Lauda.	

AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.	ROMAN.
9. Oratio super sindonem.		
10. Offertorium.	10. Sacrificium.	10. Offertorium.
11. Oratio super oblatam,	11. Missa.	
	12. Alia Oratio.	
	13. Post Nomina.	
	14. Ad Pacem.	
15. Præfatio.	15. Illatio.	15. Præfatio.
	16. Post Sanctus.	
	17. Post Pridie.	
18. Confractorium.	18. Ad Confractionem.	
	19. Ad Orationem Dominicam.	
	20. Benedictio.	
21. Transitorium.	21. Ad accedentes, or ad accedendum.	
	22. Communio.	
23. Oratio post Communionem.	23. Oratio.	23. Postcommunio.

We will now take these in order.

The Ambrosian *Ingressa* differs from the Mozarabic and Roman in its construction; not consisting, as they do, of an anthem broken by V. and R., but a simple consecutive clause. Perhaps in the beauty of these Milan may challenge any other Liturgy; and every ritualist knows of how great importance it is that the key-note of the whole service, the Antiphon, so to speak, of the whole hymn of praise, should be expressive. Let us take the six Sundays of Advent as examples in each.

AMBROSIAN.  
1. Unto Thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul: my God, I have put my trust in Thee: O let me not be confounded, neither let mine enemies triumph over me. For all those that seek Thee shall not be confounded.

MOZARABIC.  
1. Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that evangeliseth peace, Alleluia, that announceth good things, Alleluia: celebrate, O Judah, thy Festivals, Alleluia, and perform to the Lord thy vows. Alleluia. *V.* The LORD gave the word: great was the company of the preachers. *Ps.* And perform. *V.* Glory and honour to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. *Ps.* And perform. *V.* For ever and ever.

The Ambrosian *Ingressa* for the first Sunday in Advent is the same as the Roman, though a little abbreviated. To our taste, as the opening of the season, the Mozarabic is the finer, nevertheless.

2. Remember us, O Lord, according to the favour that Thou bearest unto Thy people: O visit us with

2. Get thee up upon the high mountain, thou that evangelisest to Sion, lift up thy voice with strength, thou

Thy salvation. That we may see the felicity of Thy chosen, and rejoice in the gladness of Thy people, and give thanks with Thine inheritance.

3. His fruit shall be lifted up above Lebanon, and they shall flourish out of the city like grass upon the earth: and His Name shall be blessed for ever: and His Name shall remain before the sun, and His seat before the moon for ever and ever: and in Him shall the ends of the earth be blessed.

Observe that, though the Ambrosian Ingressa comes a great deal nearer to the Italian than it does to the Vulgate Version, yet it is not exactly the same with either; on which we shall have more to say presently.

4. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the LORD: make straight in the desert a high-way for our GOD.

5. Drop down, ye heavens, from above, and let the clouds rain the Righteous One: let the earth be opened, and let it bud forth the Saviour.

6. Dost thou behold Elizabeth discoursing with Mary the Mother of GOD: Why hast thou come to me, Mother of thy GOD? Had I known it, I would have come to meet thee. For thou bearest the Ruler, and I the Prophet: thou the Lawgiver,—and I the Law-receiver: thou the Word, and I the Voice that proclaimeth the Saviour.

The last Ingressa is from S. Ambrose himself; and this is the case in several other instances. We are not sure that, in these Advent Introits, Milan has always the advantage over Toledo: the Antiphons of the former are more subjective—to use a word we greatly dislike—especially the earlier ones. But it is a sad flaw in the Mozarabic office to have a repetition, without sense or beauty, of two Introits, so unlike the superabounding fullness of that ritual in many cases.

There is nothing more profitable to ritualists than—if we may borrow a term from another art—*comparative ecclesiology*; and we propose to introduce a little in the course of this paper. Notice, in the Roman Introits, that the first is the same as the first in both Ambrosian and Mozarabic; and that the fourth is

that evangelisest to Jerusalem. Say to the cities of Judah, Alleluia, Alleluia. *V.* Our GOD shall manifestly come, our GOD, and shall not keep silence. Alleluia. *Ps.* Say. *V.* Glory and honour. *Ps.* Say.

3. Behold, the glory of the LORD shall be revealed. Alleluia. And all flesh shall see. Alleluia. That the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it. Alleluia. *V.* Our GOD shall manifestly come: our GOD, and shall not keep silence, Alleluia. *Ps.* That the. *V.* Glory and honour. *Ps.* That the.

4. *As the first.*

5. *As the second.*

6. Holy LORD GOD Omnipotent: Which is, and was, and is to come: Alleluia, Alleluia. *V.* Our GOD shall manifestly come: our GOD, and shall not keep silence. Alleluia. *Ps.* Which is. *V.* Glory and honour. *Ps.* Which is.



the same as the fifth of Milan, and exquisitely beautiful it is. The second is—'People of Sion, behold the Lord cometh to 'save the nations: and the Lord shall cause the glory of his 'voice to be heard in the joy of your heart. *Ps.* Give ear, O 'Thou Shepherd of Israel, Thou that ledest Joseph like a sheep. 'V. Glory.' The third is simply—'Rejoice in the Lord alway,' &c. But it is to be observed, that the *Rorate* of the fourth Sunday is not Gregorian. In the original office it is, 'Remember me, O Lord, with the favour that Thou bearest unto Thy people,'—with the rest. This is retained in many German Missals, as, for example, the Halberstadt and the Nuremberg; also in our own. When was it altered? The old Introit is retained in Durandus (who wrote in 1286). But then here is a difficulty. Sicardus,<sup>1</sup> who died in 1214, speaks of it as a modern one (wherein he is mistaken): still this would seem to prove that the *Rorate* was already employed in some places.

We must return to our proper subject, and will proceed to point out some examples on which we think the Ambrosian *Ingressa* singularly happy. That for Christmas Day is curious, from its peculiar reading: 'Rejoice, O barren, *thou that wast 'athirst*:<sup>2</sup> let the desert be glad: rejoice, O ye waste places of 'Judah, for our Lord hath come and redeemed us.' That for New Year's Day is of the most venerable antiquity, and clearly referable to a period when Paganism was still a persecuting power, in allusion to the heathen festival of the New Year. We are not aware that this has ever been pointed out; but, so far as our reading goes, this is the oldest bit of any peculiar *Missa* (always excepting No. IV. of the Reichenau collection) which remains. 'In the sight of the Gentiles fear ye not; but 'do ye in your hearts adore and fear the Lord: for his angel is 'with you.' (Baruch vi. 5.) On the Epiphany, while the Roman gives us 'Behold, the Lord the Ruler cometh, and in His Hand is glory, and might, and empire,'—an Antiphon of no especial propriety,—and the Mozarabic refers to the ancient Spanish custom of public Baptism at Epiphany, the Ambrosian has, with exquisite beauty, 'The city hath no need either of the 'sun or of the moon to lighten it, for God is the brightness of it.

<sup>1</sup> His words are:—'In quo utero videns gentilitas calceatam fore Divinitatem in Introitu secundum quosdam modernos, clamat ad eam, dicens, Memento nostri,' &c. *Mitrale* v. 4, p. 214. CD. We have been asked, why in former papers on Ritual in the *Christian Remembrancer* we have made so much use of this author, who is never quoted by the Master Ritualists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The *Mitrale* of Sicardus was only for the first time printed by the Abbé Migne, in 1855: those great men, therefore, had no opportunity of referring to a book which it is as necessary that the modern ritualist should have at his finger ends as Durandus or Hugh of S. Victor or Rupert.

<sup>2</sup> *Quæ sitiebas*. The Vulgate, both in Isaiah and in the Galatians, gives simply, *Quæ non paris*.

'And the nations shall walk in its light; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour unto it.' It looks past, we see, the Lord's Epiphany, wrought once that it might be wrought for ever, and fixes its gaze on that great and true *ἐπιφάνεια* of his glory, the new heavens and the new earth.

Quicunque Christum quaeritis  
Oculos in altum tollite:  
*Illic* licebit visere  
Regale signum gloriae.

Septuagesima has a happy Introit. 'I know the thoughts that I think towards you, saith the Lord, that they are thoughts of peace and not of bitterness: ye shall call upon Me, and I will hear you: and will bring back your captivity from all places.' The Roman has only: 'The pains of hell came about me,' &c. which, though Gregorian, is rather poor. The Mozarabic, as every one knows, has no such special Sunday.

Quinquagesima presents a very singular feature. We give the Ingressa in the original. 'Jucunda est praesens vita, et transit: terribile est, Christe, judicium tuum, et permanet. Quapropter incertum honorem relinquamus, et de infinito timore cogitemus, clamantes,—Christe, miserere nobis.' Now this is almost word for word a translation of a Troparion in the Triodion for the same Sunday: a visible proof of the close connexion between Milan and the East. It is remarkable that the *Invocabit me* is common both to Milan and Rome for the first Sunday in Lent; in the Ambrosian ritual, however, it goes through the *Missæ* of the week: in the Roman, not so.

We have no observation to make on the Ingressa till we come to the Sundays after Pentecost. Here there is a remarkable agreement between the Roman and Ambrosian. The Mozarabic, up to the seventh Sunday after Pentecost, beyond which there is no office, has the unvaried 'Dominus regnavit, decorem indutus est,' &c. But the following table is worth attention:—

AMBROSIAN.

II. <i>after Pentecost.</i>	Justus es, Domine, et rectum judicium tuum: fac cum servo tuo secundum misericordiam tuam.	Is not in the Roman.
III.        ,,	Factus est Dñs protector meus: et eduxit me in latitudinem: salvum me fecit, quoniam voluit me.	Is the Introit, <i>without the Psalm</i> , for the II. Sunday in the Roman.

In this Introit, Durandus finds a reference to the Gospel, that of the great feast, where—

Villa, boves, uxor, cœnam clausere vocatis:  
Mundus, cura, caro, cœlum clausere renatis.

But the Ambrosian Gospel is on a totally different subject: the blind leading the blind in S. Luke.

IV. & XIII. *after Pentecost.*

V. & XIV.	„	Exaudi, Domine, vocem meam quâ clamavi ad te: Tibi dixit cor meum: Quæsiuit te vultus meus: vultum tuum, Domine, requiram.	Is that of the V.
		Respice in me — peccata mea, Deus meus.	Does not occur.
VI. & XV.	„	Dominus illuminatio mea— —cecidērunt.	Is that of the IV.
X.	„	Inclina, Domine, aurem tuam, et exaudi me: saluum fac servum tuum, Deus meus, sperantem in te. miserere mihi: quoniam ad te clamavi tota die.	Is the XIV.
XI.	„	Justus es, Domine, et rectum judi- cium tuum. Fac cum servo tuo secundum misericordiam tuam.	Is the XVII.

The following Ingressæ are the same:—

	After Pentecost.		After Decollat.	
	2	10	4	
	3	11	5	
	4	12		
	5	13		
	6	14		
	7	15	1 after Dedication.	
	8	After Decollat.	2 after Dedication.	
	9	1	1 of October.	
		2	2 of October.	3 after Dedication.
		3		

No doubt, originally, the first after Pentecost was the same as the tenth and twentieth: though afterwards altered for the later Festival of Trinity. The 3d of October, the Festival of the Dedication, has the following:—

‘Ye, who are about to pass over this Jordan, build an altar to the LORD of rough stone which iron hath not touched: and ye shall offer on it whole burnt sacrifices, and peace offerings to our GOD:’

which is the Mozarabic Introit for the three times of solemn public baptism.

From the *Ingressa*, we proceed to the Missal Litany, which is only said on the Sundays of Lent. There are but two; the melody is very grand, and the words are precisely of the form of a Greek ectene. That which is said on the first, third, and fifth Sundays, is as follows:—

Divinæ pacis, et indulgentiæ munera supplicantes, ex  
toto corde et ex tota anima precamur te:  
Domine, miserere.

Pro Ecclesiâ tuâ Catholicâ, quæ hic, et per universum orbem diffusa est.

R. Domine, miserere.

V. Pro Papâ nostro *II.* et Pontifice nostro *II.* et omni clero eorum, omnibusque sacerdotibus ac ministris.

V. Pro famulo tuo *II.* Imperatore et Rege nostro, et omni exercitu ejus.

V. Pro pace Ecclesiarum, vocatione Gentium et quiete populorum.

V. Pro civitate hac et conversione ejus omnibusque habitantibus in eâ.

V. Pro aeris temperiâ, et fructu et fecunditate terrarum.

V. Pro virginibus, viduis, orphanis, captivis, ac penitentibus.

V. Pro navigantibus, iter agentibus, in carceribus, in vinculis, in metallis, in exiliis, constitutis.

V. Pro iis qui diversis calamitatibus detinentur, quique spiritibus vexantur immundis.

V. Pro iis qui in sanctâ tuâ Ecclesiâ fructus misericordiæ largiuntur.

But we now wish to draw the reader's attention to a very remarkable fact, which, so far as we know, has not yet been noticed by ritualists: that the Mozarabic ectenæ are metrical. They are printed as prose, and have contracted various errors, which make them read like prose; but their metrical character is clear enough when once pointed out. And we think we shall be doing a service to ritualists if we print them here for the first time as they ought to be. We confess that, if we shall persuade the reader to think with us, we shall feel a little natural pride at having observed an important peculiarity, which had escaped the notice of Lorenzana, of Lesley, and even of Arevall. Here then they follow:—

MISSAL LITANY FOR THE FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>A 1. Jesu Unigenite<br/>Dei Patris Fili, qui<br/>Es universæ<br/>Bonitatis Dominus:<br/><i>Placare et miserere.</i></p>          | <p>Da peccatis finem.<br/>Da laboris requiem.<br/><i>Placare.</i></p>   |
| <p>A 2. Cuncti te gemitibus<br/>Exorantes poscimus:<br/>Cuncti <sup>1</sup> simul<br/>Deprecantes quæsumus.<br/><i>Placare.</i></p> | <p>C 1. Tranquillitatem temporum,<br/>Rerum abundantiam,<br/>Pacis quietem, et salutis copiam.<br/><i>Placare.</i></p>                        |
| <p>B 1. Tua jam clementia<br/>Mala nostra superet:<br/>Tuo jam sereno<br/>Vultu in nos respice.<br/><i>Placare.</i></p>             | <p>C 2. <i>Illius</i> <sup>2</sup> Pontificis<br/>Porrige præsidium:<br/>Ac <sup>3</sup> universo supplicanti populo.<br/><i>Placare.</i></p> |
| <p>B 2. Remove perpetuo<br/>Tuam iracundiam:</p>  | <p>C 3. Remissionem omnium<br/>Peccatorum quæsumus:<br/>Indulge clemens mala quæ com-<br/>misimus, <i>Placare.</i></p>                        |

<sup>1</sup> So we read for *cunctique*: the conjunction, even if there were no metrical reason, would clearly be better away.

<sup>2</sup> *Illius* being the mere 'M. or N.' of our own offices, metre must not be looked for.

<sup>3</sup> So read for *atque*.

MISSAL LITANY FOR THE SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

- A 1. Prostrati omnes lacrymas producimus :  
Et pandimus<sup>1</sup> occulta, quæ admisimus :  
A te, Deus, veniam poscimus.<sup>2</sup>  
*Quia peccavimus tibi.*
- A 2. Orationes sacerdotum accipe :  
Et quæque poscunt,<sup>3</sup> affluenter tribue :  
Ac tuæ plebi miserere, Domine.  
*Quia.*
- A 3. Furorem tuum adduxisti super nos :  
Nostra delicta dira<sup>4</sup> curvaverunt nos :  
Et absque ulla spe \* \* defecimus.  
*Quia.*
- B. Traditi sumus malis, quæ nescimus :  
Et omne malum cecidit super nos :  
Et invocavimus,<sup>5</sup> et non audimur.  
*Quia.*
- A 4. Omnes clamamus : omnes te requirimus :  
Te pœnitentes lacrymis prosequimur :  
Cujusque<sup>6</sup> iram ipsi provocavimus.  
*Quia.*
- A 5. Te, deprecantes, te, gementes, poscimus ;  
Te, Jesu Christe, prosternati petimus :  
Tua potestas jam sublevet miseros.  
*Quia.*
- A 6. Confessionem tuæ plebis accipe,  
Quam lamentantes coram te effundimus :  
Et pro admissis corde ingemiscimus.  
*Quia.*
- A 7. Pacem rogamus, pacem nobis tribue ;  
Amove bella, et nos omnes erue ;  
Humili prece postulamus, Domine.  
*Quia.*
- A 8. Inclina aurem, Deus clementissime ;  
Jam abluantur delictorum maculæ ;  
Et a periculis<sup>7</sup> nos benignus erue.  
*Quia peccavimus tibi.*

<sup>1</sup> The book gives *pandentes tibi*, which is inadmissible. We should not wonder if the true reading were *pandentes te*: the ablative, in the Mozarabic offices, being so often used for other cases.

<sup>2</sup> The book, *deposcimus*.

<sup>3</sup> The book, *postulant*.

<sup>4</sup> Who does not see that in mere prose such a collocation and such a phrase would be intolerable?

<sup>5</sup> The book, *invocamus*.

<sup>6</sup> Notice the *que*, which seems only inserted for the sake of the metre.

<sup>7</sup> The book, *periculis*.

Now, there are several peculiarities about this singular Litany. The first, that it is undoubtedly A. B. C. Darian. We have ventured, in order to bring this out, to make one or two alterations of arrangement. In the original, the verses stand in this way:—1, 2, 6, 3, 4, 7, 8, 5. Also the 3d verse, as we give it, stands in the original:—*Assistant bona, discedant hostes*: but, as all the other verses rhyme assonantly, if not consonantly, an alteration is necessary here even on that ground only. The verse that begins with C. is lost.

MISSAL LITANY FOR THE THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

Rogamus te, Rex sæculorum, Deus Sancte,  
*Jam miserere, peccavimus tibi.*

A 1. Audi clamantes, Deus altissime :  
Et quæ precamur, clemens attribue :  
Exaudi nos, Domine.  
*Jam miserere.*

A 2. Bone Redemptor, supplices quæsumus,  
De toto corde flentes requirimus :  
Assiste propitius.  
*Jam miserere.*

A 3. Discedant hostes, accedant bona ;  
Pessima incumbent clades inopiâ :  
Tu, Christe, nos libera.  
*Jam miserere.*

A 4. Emitte manum, Deus omnipotens,  
Et invocantes potenter protege  
Ex alto, piissime.  
*Jam miserere.*

A 5. Fertilitatem et pacem tribue :  
Remove bella, et famem cohibe,  
Redemptor sanctissime :  
*Jam miserere.*

A 6. Gemitus vide ; fletus intellige :  
Extende manum : peccantes redime  
\* \* \* \* \*  
*Jam miserere.*

A 7. Hanc nostram, Deus, hanc precem suscipe :  
Supplicum voces pacatus suscipe :  
Et parce, piissime.  
*Jam miserere.*

A 8. Indulge lapsis : indulge perditis :  
Dimitte noxia ; ablue crimina :  
Acclives tu libera  
*Jam miserere.*



MISSAL LITANY FOR THE FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

- A 1. A Patre missus, veni  
Perditos requirere :  
Et hoste captivatos  
Sanguine redimere :  
Plebs dira abjecit me.  
*Miserere, Pater juste, et omnibus  
indulgentiam da.*
- A 2. Prædictus a Prophetis  
Natus sum ex Virgine :  
Assumpsi formam servi  
Perditos colligere :  
Venantes ceperunt me.  
*Miserere.*
- A 3. Mihi pro bonis mala  
Reddita sunt plurima :  
Adversum me dederunt  
Iniqua consilia,  
Venditum pecunia.  
*Miserere.*
- B. Spineam coronam  
Posuerunt capiti  
Sputis sordidato :  
Illuserunt impii  
Afflictum crudeliter.  
*Miserere.*
- A 4. Cum noxiis latronibus<sup>1</sup>  
Suspensum patibulo,  
Amaro cibo pastum,
- Et acerbo poculo  
Traditum supplicio.  
*Miserere.*
- A 5. Quos veni liberare,  
Hi accusaverunt me :  
Flagellis verberatum  
Cruci affixerunt me :  
Lanceâ<sup>2</sup> percusserunt me.  
*Miserere.*
- A 6. Qui impio latroni  
Dimisisti scelera,  
Tu solve vincla<sup>3</sup> nostra  
Et relaxa crimina :  
Salva nos cruce tua.  
*Miserere.*
- A 7. Traditus sum sepulchro :  
Fregi portas inferi  
Ejeci vinculatos  
Et reduxi ad superos  
Ostendi in victima.  
*Miserere.*
- C 1. Pater clementissime,  
Dimitte illis noxia :  
Cuncta dele peccata,  
Et relaxa crimina :  
Ignorant quid faciunt.  
*Miserere.*

MISSAL LITANY FOR THE FIFTH SUNDAY.

Insidiati sunt adversarii mei gratis.

*Tu, Pater Sancte, miserere, et libera me.*

- A 1. Portatus sum, ut Agnus  
Innocens in Victimam.  
Captus ab inimicis  
Ut avis in muscipulam,  
Magis gratis.  
*Tu, Pater Sancte.*
- A 2. Aperuerunt omnes  
Ora sua contra me ;  
Dentibus fremuerunt,  
Quærentes deglutire me,  
Magis gratis.  
*Tu, Pater Sancte.*
- A 3. Sibilantes clamabant,  
Et movebant capita ;  
Tractantes de me falsa  
Proferre testimonia,  
Magis gratis.  
*Tu, Pater Sancte.*
- A 4. Suspensum cruci damnant  
Fixum clavis ferreis :  
Venditum a Judæis  
Pro triginta argenteis,  
Magis gratis.  
*Tu, Pater Sancte.*

<sup>1</sup> We have little doubt that this ought to be *latronis*, from the barbarous *latronus*.

<sup>2</sup> The last two syllables of such words coalesce in Mozarabic hymns, as in modern Portuguese and Spanish, and must be taken to do so here.

<sup>3</sup> The book, *vincula*.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>A 5. In latere confossus<br/>         Gladio horifico:<br/>         Illico fluit latex<br/>         Cum sanguine innoxio,<br/>         Magis gratis.<br/> <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> <p>A 6. Omnes inundaverunt<br/>         Quasi aquæ super me,<br/>         Dimissum in sepulchro:<br/>         Apposuerunt lapidem,<br/>         Magis gratis.<br/> <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> <p>A 7. Confusa palluerunt<br/>         Cuncta cœli sidera:<br/>         Dies obtenebratur<br/>         Cum vidit pati Dominum,<br/>         Magis gratis.<br/> <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> | <p>A 8. Sic Judæorum turba<br/>         Cæcâ diffidentia<br/>         Deposcut a Pilato<br/>         Milites pro custodiâ:<br/>         Magis gratis.<br/> <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> <p>A 9. Tunc milites dividunt<br/>         Vestem meam sortibus:<br/>         Cernentes<sup>1</sup> in me flagra<br/>         Injusta et sævissima,<br/>         Magis gratis.<br/> <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> <p>A 10. Intende, pie Pater,<br/>         Et succurre miseris,<br/>         Pro quibus tam acerbis<br/>         Afficior suppliciis,<br/>         Magis gratis.<br/> <i>Tu, Pater Sancte.</i></p> |
|--|--|

There is some, but a very slight and corrupted trace of these Litanies in the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum* published by Mabillon, and reprinted by Migne. Those which the Mozarabic Ritual gives for the fourth and fifth Sundays in Lent are, but in a very fragmentary state, attributed to Easter Eve.

We next come to the *Oratio super populum*, which is, in fact, the Collect for the Day, and ought to be distinguished from the<sup>2</sup> Gallican Prayer of the same name, which occurs towards the end, and is equivalent to the Benediction. There is no such collect in the Mozarabic; and this is the one great advantage, and we think the only one, which the present office has over that. Now it is very singular to compare the Milanese *Oratio super populum* with the Roman Collect. The instances in which they are the same are as follows:—The Ambrosian for feriæ in Advent is the Roman for its fourth Sunday. The prayers are identical in—First Mass at Christmas, S. Thomas of Canterbury (of course), Epiphany III., Epiphany V. In Lent (it must be remembered that there is no Ambrosian office for the Fridays) the Sundays are always different. The week-days are the same with these exceptions:—Thursday in the second and third weeks; in the fourth Tuesday and Saturday; also, the Ambrosian Thursday is

<sup>1</sup> For *decernentes*.

<sup>2</sup> It is odd that, in speaking of the latter, Liturgical writers do not refer to the Ambrosian use of the terms: so for example Gerbertus, *Liturg. Alemann.* Tom. i. p. 400. It is to the Gallican use, of course, that Micrologus alludes, where we find: '*Oratio post communionem pro solis communicantibus debet orari. Populus autem etsi quotidie in Quadragesima convenit, non tamen quotidie, ut deberet, communicat. Ne ergo populus ita oratione careret, adjecta est Oratio super populum, in qua non de communicatione, sed de populi protectione oratur specialiter.*' In this sense, the Roman Missal has the *Super populum* in Lent, but in Lent only.

the Roman Friday: in Passion Week, Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Saturday: in Holy Week, Friday, Saturday. In Easter Week, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday are the same. So is the first Sunday after. The Roman third is the Milanese fourth; Trinity and the first Sunday after Pentecost are the same; three or four others of the Sundays after Trinity have the same Collects, though not in the same order. To which we may add that the Ambrosian S. Stephen is the same as the Roman Octave.

But, the same or not the same, these Collects have exactly a similar character with those to which we are accustomed; so similar, that it is not worth while to dwell at any further length on them. We proceed to the Prophecy.

The Prophecy is read on all Sundays and Festivals, but not in Ferial Masses. This also was the Gallican as well as the Mozarabic use; and a curious vestige of it was kept up in some of the French churches even in the eighteenth century. So it was at the three Masses of Christmas in the cathedrals of Vienne, Rouen, and Orleans (only at Vienne *after* the Epistle): so in the third Mass at Fontevraud, at all three at Auxerre, at all the highest festivals at Orleans; at Christmas in S. Aygnan, at Orleans; so at the Collegiate Church of Jargeau; also at Rouen S. Lo.

We give those for the first three weeks in Advent:—

	AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.
Advent 1.	Isaiah li. 4—8.	Isaiah x. 33; xi. 10.
2.	Baruch iv. 36; v. 9.	Isaiah li. 7—12.
3.	Isaiah xxxv.	Isaiah li. 1—6.
4.	Isaiah xl. 1—11.	Isaiah xxiv. 16—23.
5.	Micah v. 2, 3, and Malachi iii. 1—7.	Isaiah xvi. 1—5.
6.	Isaiah lxii. 8; lxiii. 4.	Isaiah xxxv.
Christmas Day.	Isaiah ix. 1—7.	Isaiah ix. 1—7.
3d Mass.		
St. Stephen.	Acts vi. 9, 10, and vii. 54—60.	Acts vi. and vii. 51—viii. 3.
S. John Ev.	1 St. John i.	Wisdom x. 10—18.
Holy Innocents.	Jeremiah xxxi. 15—20.	Jeremiah xxxi. 15—20.
Circumcision.	Baruch vi. 1, 2.	Isaiah xlviii. 12—20.
	Jeremiah lvii. 52—54.	
	Baruch vi. 4—7.	
Sunday in the Octave.	Isaiah viii. 9—18.	Isaiah xlix. 1—6.
Epiphany.	Isaiah lx. 1—6.	Isaiah lx. 1—19.
1st Sunday after Epiph.	Isaiah lxi. 1—3, and lxii. 11, 12.	Isaiah lii. 1—10.
2d	Acts iv. 9—12.	Isaiah lxxv. 17—24.
3d	Ezekiel xxxvii. 21—28.	Isaiah lxxvi. 1—14.
4th	Jerem. xxxiii. 14—21.	Jeremiah xxxi. 31—34.
5th	Malachi iii. 9—12.	Jeremiah xxxi. 10—14.

	AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.
6th Sunday after Epiph.	Malachi iii. 13—18.	Jeremiah iii. 29; iv. 2.
7th, or Septuagesima.	Joel ii. 12—21.	Jeremiah vii. 1—7.
8th, or Sexagesima.	Ezekiel xxxiii. 7—11.	Jeremiah xiii.
9th, or Quinquagesima.	Zachariah ix. 5—14.	Isaiah lv.
In Cap. Jejuni.		Proverbs i. 23—32.
Lent, 1st Sunday.	Isaiah lviii. 1—12.	Isaiah lv.
Monday.	Ezekiel xxxiv. 11—16.	
Tuesday.	Isaiah lv. 6—11.	
Wednesday.	Exodus xxiv. 12—18.	Prov. xiii. 22; xiv. 11.
		Exod. xxxiv. 27—35.
Thursday.	Ezekiel xviii. 1—9.	
Friday.		Eccles. xxix. 1—12.
Saturday.	<i>Epistle.</i>	Gen. xxxi. 17; xxxii. 1.
Lent, 2d Sunday.	Exodus xx. 1—24.	Gen. xli. 1—45.
Monday.	Daniel ix. 15—19.	
Tuesday.	1 Kings xvii. 8—16.	
Wednesday.	Esther xiii. 9—17.	Prov. xxvii. 23; xxviii. 10; Exod. ii. 11; iii. 15.
Thursday.	Jeremiah xvii. 5—10.	
Friday.		Wisdom xviii. 15—21.
		Exod. xiii. 17; xiv. 14.
Saturday.		
Lent, 3d Sunday.	Exodus xxxiv. 1—10.	Prov. xx. 17—28.
		Numb. xxii. 1; xxiii. 10.
Monday.	2 Kings v. 1—15.	
Tuesday.	2 Kings iv. 1—7.	
Wednesday.	Exodus xx. 12—24.	Prov. xxi. 22—31.
		Judges i. 1—26.
Thursday.	Jeremiah vii. 1—7.	
Friday.		Eccles. ix. 1—10.
		Judges xvi.
Saturday.		
Lent, 4th Sunday.	Exodus xxxiv. 23—32.	Eccles. xiv. 11—19.
		1 Sam. i. 1—20.

The Prophecy is followed by the Psalmellus, a verse and response almost always taken from the Psalms, and in the same order and connexion in which they occur in the Psalter. It is frequently in fact the same as, though not theoretically agreeing with, the Roman Gradual. There is nothing that seems particularly to call for remark in this Antiphon; and we will therefore proceed to the Epistle.

Advent:—

AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.	ROMAN.
1. 2 Thessal. ii. 1—14.	Rom. xv. 14—29.	Rom. xii.

It is somewhat singular to find the first epistle in Advent setting forth that the day of Christ is *not* at hand; yet, perhaps, as a warning of the terrors for which the faithful must be prepared before the Lord's coming, the Ambrosian Epistle is not ill-chosen. The appropriateness of the Mozarabic we fail to see,

though we are far too well aware of the admirable skill which has grouped that noble office, to feel any doubt that the fault is in ourselves.

- |                     |                 |        |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------|
| AMBROSIAN.          | MOZARABIC.      | ROMAN. |
| 2. Romans xv. 1—13. | Rom. xiii. 1—8. |        |

The Ambrosian is the same as the Roman for *its* second Sunday; the testimony of Scripture to our Lord's Advent. The Mozarabic is again difficult of comprehension, unless we say that it refers to our Lord's birth in Bethlehem as having taken place there through his parents' obedience 'to the higher powers,' and their fulfilment of the concluding clause,—'Tribute to whom tribute.'

- |                        |                     |                       |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 3. Rom. xi. 25 to end. | Rom. xi. 25 to end. | Rom. xiii. 11 to end. |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|

The Milanese and Spanish not inappropriately recite the prophecy of the restoration of Israel and the call of the Gentiles as events that must precede the final Advent. The Antiphona post Evang. of the former carries on the same train of thought, 'Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel;' and the Offertory unites the prophecy of Joel, 'There shall no strangers pass through Jerusalem any more,' with the command to Joshua, 'Arise and pass over this Jordan,'—the first entrance on the Promised Land being a type of the final return. The Roman Office most strikingly commences that Advent with the trumpet call of, 'Now it is high time to awake out of sleep.'

- |                      |                   |                |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 4. Hebrews x. 35—39. | 1 Cor. xv. 23—31. | Rom. xv. 1—13. |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|

The Ambrosian is singularly appropriate. 'He that shall come, will come, and will not tarry.' The Mozarabic, with its prophecy of 'Then cometh the end,' happily converts what we have been accustomed to consider an Easter, into an Advent Epistle. Of the Roman we have spoken.

- |                    |                      |                   |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| 5. Gal. iv. 22—31. | 1 Thessal. v. 14—23. | Philipp. iv. 4—7. |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|

The parable of Agar, we imagine, is introduced to teach patience under the sufferings which the Church must endure, before the coming of the Lord shall end her sufferings for ever. The Mozarabic ends suitably with, 'Your whole spirit and soul 'and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord 'Jesus Christ,' as appropriate a close as is that of the Roman,—'The Lord is at hand.'

- |                      |                      |                 |
|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| 6. Philipp. iv. 4—9. | 2 Thessal. ii. 1—14. | 2 Cor. iv. 1—8. |
|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|

The Ambrosian gives us last Sunday's Roman Epistle,—we think, in a better position. Nothing can more fitly close the

series of Advent predictions. The Mozarabic ends with that prophecy of Antichrist with which the Ambrosian commenced, and surely more suitably placed. It is worth notice that Durandus tells us how, in his days, some churches transposed these epistles, reading that from the Corinthians on the third Sunday, that from the Philippians on the fourth. Sicardus however and Rupert give no hint of this.

The Nativity:—

AMBROSIAN.	MOZARABIC.	ROMAN.
Hebrews i. 1—8.	Hebrews i. 1—12.	Hebrews i. 1—12.

Saint Stephen:—

2 Timothy iii. 17; iv. 8.	Acts vi. 1 to end; and vii. 1; and 51—60.	Acts vi. 8—10; and vii. 54—60.
------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------

The Ambrosian, relegating the account of the Protomartyr's Triumph to the Prophecy, chooses a most happy epistle, not only from the appositeness of the 'I have fought a good fight,' &c., but from the reference to S. Stephen's constant allusion to Scripture in the commencement,—'All Scripture is given,' &c., and the glance at the season of the year at its conclusion,—'all them also that love His appearing.' The Mozarabic is a better compendium of the history than the Roman; both, however, shine in comparison with the wretched arrangement of lessons and epistles in our own Prayer-book.

Saint John Evangelist:—

Rom. x. 8—15.	1 Thessal. iv. 13 to end.	Ecclus. xv. 1—6.
---------------	---------------------------	------------------

The Ambrosian prophecy, though not the same passage as the Roman epistle, is to the same effect; both, of course, referring to him who gathered his marvellous depth of theology by lying on the breast of the True Wisdom. The epistle seems less appropriate; it would be equally suitable for any Apostle. The Mozarabic appears of great antiquity, the 'we which are 'alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them that are asleep' clearly referring to the saying that went 'out among the brethren that that disciple should not die.'

Holy Innocents:—

Rom. viii. 14—21.	2 Cor. i. 3—7.	Rev. xiv. 1—5.
-------------------	----------------	----------------

Both Ambrosian and Mozarabic epistles suit well enough to the sorrow of the bereaved Mothers; but how infinitely inferior to the Roman (and our own) glorious Lection! Our and the Roman lesson from Jeremiah, forms the epistle of Milan and Toledo. Durandus, however, gives the lesson from Jeremiah as



the proper epistle; but some churches, says he, where Alleluia is sung on this day, have that from the Revelation. In the Roman Rite, however, Alleluia is only sung on the Octave, signifying the joy of the happy infants in the Eternal Octave of Beatitude. We cannot find the epistle from Jeremiah in any ancient Missal within our reach.

Circumcision:—

AMBROSIAN.  
Philipp. iii. 1—8.

MOZARABIC.  
Philipp. iii. 1—8.

ROMAN.  
Gal. iv. 1—7.

The Ambrosian and Mozarabic dwell with propriety on the abolition of Jewish circumcision; the Roman is simply for the Octave. We do not exactly understand the Halberstadt. It gives Gal. iii. 23—iv. 1, for the epistle; and then it follows, *Epistola sequens legitur in Circumcisione Domini.*—Col. i. 23—28.

Epiphany:—

Titus ii. 11; iii. 2. Gal. iii. 27; iv. 7. Isaiah lx. 1—7.

The force of the Ambrosian lies in its commencement, ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, κ. τ. λ., which would seem to give it a Greek origin. The Mozarabic refers to the Epiphany Baptism, a Spanish custom abolished by S. Damasus and S. Himerius of Tarragona; therefore the epistle is earlier than the fourth century. The Roman Epistle forms the prophecy in the others, and was the prophecy as early as the fifth century. For in one of the sermons of S. Maximus of Turin on that day (he of course belonged to the Italic province) we have this commencement:—‘Ait Prophetarum præcipuus Isaïas, ‘sicut audistis, fratres charissimi, Illuminare, illuminare Jeru-salem.’ So it is in the lectionary of Luxeuil.

Christophory:—

Heb. xi. 13—16.

First Sunday after Epiphany:—

Ephes. iv. 23—28. Rom. i. 1—17. Rom. xii. 1—5.

The Mozarabic on this day begins the Epistle to the Romans, and reads on from it for five Sundays. The Luxoviense differs from all, having 1 Cor. i. 15—31. Ritualists are not well agreed as to the reason of the Roman Epistle. Durandus speaks of the ‘living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God’ as the antitype of the Three Kings. Sicardus speaks of the joyous character of the whole office, inviting as it does to praise; but since ‘praise is unbecoming in the mouth of a sinner,’ the epistle, he says, speaks of holiness.

## After Epiphany:—

	MOZARABIC.	AMBROSIAN.	ROMAN.
Second Sunday.	Rom. vi. 12—18.	1 Cor. i. 1—5.	Rom. xii. 6—16.
Third Sunday.	Rom. vi. 19—25.	Gal. v. 26; vi. 6.	Rom. xii. 16—21.
Fourth Sunday.	Rom. vii. 14 to end.	Col. i. 3—11.	Rom. xiii. 8—10.

It is worth while to observe that the scope of the Roman Epistles during this season, is the objective action of the law of God on the mind of man; whereas the other two rites rather dwell on his subjective reception of it. There is a curious reading at the conclusion of the last-named Mozarabic Epistle. 'Infelix ego homo; quis me liberabit de corpore mortis hujus? Gratia Dei, *vita et pax*: per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum.'

Fifth Sunday.	Rom. viii. 3—9.	Rom. xiii. 8—10.	Col. iii. 12—17.
Sixth Sunday.	1 Cor. i. 10—17.	Col. ii. 1—7.	1 Thess. i. 2 to end.

## Septuagesima:—

1 Cor. ii. 10; iii. 6. 1 Cor. ix. 24; x. 4. 1 Cor. ix. 24; x. 5.

We must first remember that the Mozarabic has no such season as Septuagesima; but goes on counting its Sundays from after Epiphany to the commencement of the Fast. We may doubt whether the original arrangement of the Ambrosian were not the same, and its present office simply borrowed from the Roman. It is to be observed that the Roman continues the allegory of the Apostle, taken from the games, by adding his description of the journeyings of the Jews in the wilderness, and thereby points out the identity of his argument in both cases. 'I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest,' &c. 'For,' or 'Now,' (not *moreover*,) 'brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant,' &c. He is assigning the cause why the body of a Christian should be kept in subjection, as having, like the Jews, eaten that spiritual meat and received that spiritual drink. Our reformers, tied down by their unhappy adherence to chapters, miss or neglect this connexion, and end with the conclusion of the ninth.

## Sexagesima:—

1 Cor. xii. 27—xiii. 9. 1 Cor. ix. 7—12. 2 Cor. xi. 19—xii. 9.

Observe first that the Ambrosian Office is simply going through the most striking passages of the Corinthians, after having in like manner gone through the Romans. It seems difficult to understand why the description of charity, so very appropriate for the near approach of the Fast at Quinquagesima, should have been put back a Sunday by the Mozarabic. The Roman Epistle, which the Sarum follows, is simply selected on

this account, that the Station is, on that Sunday, in the Basilic of S. Paul; and to him, therefore, do the Collect and Epistle more especially point. It is almost needless to observe that our Collect, 'O God, who seest that we put not our trust in anything that we do,' is altered from the original, which concludes thus:—'Mercifully grant, that, by the intercession of the Doctor of the Gentiles, we may be defended against all adversity.' It is rather singular that in the German Missals, where there is no reason for the commemoration of S. Paul on this day, the same Collect and Epistle are always found.

Ash-Wednesday:—

MOZARABIC.	AMBROSIAN.	ROMAN.
S. James i. 13—21.	None.	Joel ii. 12—19.

It was not till the final alteration of the Mozarabic Rite by Cardinal Ximenes, that the season of Lent was extended backwards to Ash-Wednesday. Till then, it commenced, as does the Ambrosian to this day, with the First Sunday, thus containing only thirty-six days complete; the tenth part, roughly measured, of the whole year. Those who made the alteration, did it after a most clumsy fashion, changing Epistles and Gospels so as to deprive them of all appropriateness of position. The office for Ash-Wednesday is that which was, in Gotho-Hispanic times, the office for the First Sunday in Lent: the present first, the original second; the present second, the original third; the present third, the original fifth. The fourth, or *Mediante*, is as it was; the fifth is new; the sixth, or *De Traditione*, is as it was.

First Sunday in the Fast:—

2 Cor. v. 20—vi. 10.	2 Cor. vi. 1—10.	2 Cor. vi. 1—10.
----------------------	------------------	------------------

We may observe that henceforth, during the Fast, the Ambrosian, like the Roman, has a special office for every day; but with this difference, that there is none for Friday. The Mozarabic, on the contrary, has no especial office except for Wednesday and Friday. Here, then, is a clear trace of the influence which the Eastern Church possessed at Milan; as we know it did in many other things, as, for example, in the festal character of Saturday. The Greek Church, as every one knows, never celebrates in Lent, except on the Saturdays, Sundays, and High Festivals; and here we find Milan doing the same on one day in each quadragesimal week. Notice this also. On the first four days of the week, the lections are, at Milan, Prophecy and Gospel, the Epistle being omitted.

First Sunday in Lent:—

2 Cor. v. 20—vi. 10.	2 Cor. vi. 1—10.	2 Cor. vi. 1—10.
----------------------	------------------	------------------

This Epistle, common to the three rites, arms, says Durandus, the faithful with the four cardinal virtues; and certainly a more appropriate one could not have been selected.

Second Sunday in Lent:—

MOZARABIC.	AMBROSIAN.	ROMAN.
James ii. 14—23.	Ephesians i. 15—23.	1 Thess. iv. 1—8.

The Roman Epistle, as all the ritualists tell us, occupies this place, because when the Church begins to descend from generals to particulars, she warns her children against the sin of impurity as that which has destroyed infinitely more than any other. Hence also the selection of what otherwise seems inappropriate, the Transfiguration for the Gospel; as if she would teach us how those bodies are to be honoured and held in reverence, the future glorification of which was so miraculously manifested by our Lord. This, however, is a strictly Roman use; and the majority of other Churches read, as did the Sarum, and as we still do, the history of the Syro-Phœnician woman. In the very ancient *Capitulare Evangeliorum*, published by Thomasius, this Sunday is 'vacant'—that is, had no proper office, on account of the very heavy duty of the preceding Saturday in Ordinations. Hence some, at a later time, took the preceding Thursday's Gospel, that of the Syro-Phœnician; others that of the Friday, the Transfiguration. Durandus simply says that 'in some Churches' the Transfiguration is read for the Gospel. The Mozarabic very appropriately gives us S. James's lesson on the necessity of works; and the Ambrosian not less fitly calls off our thoughts from the sufferings of the present Fast to the glory which is to be their result.

Third Sunday in Lent:—

1 S. Pet. i. 1—12.	1 Thess. ii. 20; iii. 8.	Ephes. v. 1—9.
--------------------	--------------------------	----------------

Mid-Lent Sunday:—

2 S. Pet. i. 1—9.	1 Thess. iv. 1—12.	Gal. iv. 22—31.
-------------------	--------------------	-----------------

Passion Sunday:—

1 S. John i. 1—7.	Ephes. v. 15—21.	Heb. ix. 11—15.
-------------------	------------------	-----------------

Palm Sunday:—

Gal. i. 1—12.	2 Thess. ii. 15—iii. 5.	Philipp. ii. 1—11.
---------------	-------------------------	--------------------

Of these Epistles, the two most striking to our mind are the Mozarabic for Passion and Palm Sunday, the former ending with the words which form so complete an Antiphon to the whole of Passion-tide: 'The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin;' the latter, that anathema of S. Paul on those who should preach any other Gospel than that of the Atone-

ment, which the following week is to set forth. The Ambrosian Epistle for Palm Sunday seems at first sight utterly inappropriate. But the reason is this. The preceding Saturday is that of the Tradition of the Symbol; and although the Creed in the Milanese Church is not now actually delivered to the Catechumens, as it is in the Mozarabic, the Epistle with reference to the ancient rite begins very properly, 'Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions you have been taught.'

We have now said enough about the Epistle. A few words are all that we must allow ourselves on the Gospel. Those in Lent are the most deserving of our attention. The Ambrosian for the First Sunday, which, we must again repeat, is the actual commencement of their Lent, has the Gospel of the Temptation from S. Matthew. It was so originally in the Mozarabic Office, though now it is thrown back to Ash-Wednesday. The Second Sunday is in the Ambrosian called the Sunday of the Samaritan, the Gospel being that chapter in S. John. So it originally was in the Mozarabic, though now appropriated to the First Sunday. The Illation—which in the Ambrosian Rite is always called the Preface—of the two Churches is worth comparing. The Milanese runs thus:—'Through Christ our Lord. Who, that He might quietly teach the mystery of His humanity, sat down weary by the well; and besought the Samaritan woman that she would give Him water to drink, because He had created in her the gifts of faith. And He thus vouchsafed to thirst after her belief, that while He asked water from her, He kindled the fire of Divine love in her. We implore then Thy boundless mercy that we, despising the dark abyss of vices, and leaving behind us the pitcher of noxious lusts, may perpetually thirst for Thee, Who art the fountain of life, and the origin of all good things, and may please Thee by the observation of our fast.'

The Mozarabic is five times as long, but ends in the same way:—

'For Thou art our God; cast us not away from Thy face; but look upon us now whom Thou didst through free mercy create: that when Thou shalt have removed from us all the debt of sin, Thou mayest also render us well-pleasing in the sight of Thy love. That we, delivered from the abyss of the noxious well of misdeeds, leaving behind us the pitcher of our lusts, may, after the course of this life, hasten together to that eternal city, Jerusalem: that with all saints we may glorify Thy holy Name; thus saying,' &c.

Observe that the symbolism is nearly word for word the same: but that there is a singular mistake in the Mozarabic which does not exist in the Ambrosian. The woman left her pitcher, and went into the city; that is, the city Sichar, not the

city of Jerusalem, as the mystical interpretation obliges us to understand it.

The Third Sunday in Lent is called Abraham's Sunday; the Gospel being from the eighth chapter of S. John, where our LORD says, 'your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day,' &c. This Gospel does not occur in the Mozarabic.

The fourth Sunday is of the Man born Blind. This is now the Gospel for the second, and was originally for the third Sunday, in the Mozarabic. Both Illations have to do with the history: but there is no similarity between the two. Nowhere do we find a better example of the marvellous superiority of the office of Toledo to that of Milan, than here. Take the two as an example. We will not judge so poorly of the reader's discrimination as to say which is which.

'It is meet and right that we should render thanks to Thee, Holy LORD, Eternal FATHER, Omnipotent GOD, through JESUS CHRIST, Thy SON, our LORD, Who, by the illumination of His faith, has driven away the shadows of this world, and has made them to be sons of grace who were held under the just damnation of the law. Who thus came to judge the world, that they who see not might see, and that they who see might be made blind: that they who should confess in themselves the darkness of error, might receive light eternal, and so be freed from the shadows of guilt: and that they who, arrogant of their own merits, believed themselves to possess the light of righteousness, might deservedly be confounded in their own darkness: who, puffed up by their pride, and trusting in themselves, sought not the Physician to heal them. For by JESUS, who calls Himself the Door to the FATHER, they might have entered in. But since they were puffed up by their own merits, they remained for ever in their own blindness. Wherefore we, coming humbly before Thee, and putting no trust in our own deserts, lay open before Thy Altar, most holy Father, our own wounds, confess the darkness of our mistakes, manifest the secret offences of our consciences. Grant that we may find the medicine for our wounds, light for our darkness, purity for our conscience. With all our endeavours we desire to behold Thy face; but we are blinded and hindered by the darkness to which we are accustomed. We wish to look at the heavens and cannot; while darkened by the night of sin we cannot look to those who, on account of the holiness of their lives, deserve to be called heavens. Help us, therefore, O JESUS, as we pray in Thy Temple, [a reference to the Blind Man having been found in the Temple by our LORD,] and cure us all in this day, who wouldest not that there should be rest on the Sabbath from the working of miracles. Behold, we expose our wounds in the presence of the glory of Thy Name: do Thou bestow on our infirmities the medicine they need. Succour us as Thou hast promised while we persist, Who out of nothing hast caused that we should exist. Make plain, and anoint the eyes of our hearts and bodies; lest, through our blindness, we should fall in the dark. Behold, we wash Thy feet with our tears; send us not empty away. O good JESUS, let us not depart from Thy footsteps; Thou who didst come in Thy humility in this world. Hear the prayer of us all, and grant that we may behold the glory of Thy countenance in that beatitude of eternal peace, crying, and thus saying.'

The other Preface is as follows:—



'It is meet and salutary that to Thee, O LORD, who dwellest in the exalted citadel of the heavens, we should render thanks and should confess Thee with all our powers. For that by Thee the blindness of the world hath been removed, and true light hath shone on the weak: when among the other miracles of Thy many marvellous deeds Thou didst bid the man born blind to receive sight; in whom the human race, maculate with original blindness, is typified by a symbol of the future. For that pool of Siloam to which that blind man was sent, is nothing else but the holy and sealed fountain, where not only the bodily eyes, but the whole man is healed, through CHRIST OUR LORD.'

The Fifth Sunday in Lent, which was also called, from a reason which has not been explained, the *Dominica post Vigessimam*. In the Mozarabic Missal it is the Gospel for the original fourth, the present third, Sunday. In most other churches it is read on Friday of the fourth week, or else on Saturday of Passion Week, the day when Lazarus was actually raised. The Gospel for Palm Sunday is S. John's account of the anointing of our LORD's feet by Mary Magdalene. The arrangement of the Gospels for Holy, or, as they call it, Authentic Week, is different in the Milanese books from any other. The Passion is not read at length till the Thursday. On Monday, the Gospel is S. Luke xxi. 34—38. On Tuesday, S. John xi. 47—54. On Wednesday, S. Matthew xxvi. 1—4.

One very curious Gospel it will be unpardonable not to mention. For S. Stephen's Day, in the Roman Rite, we have the prophecy from S. Matthew, also read in our own Prayer Book, of Jerusalem that killed the prophets, and stoned them that were sent into her. In the Mozarabic the selection is the same. Both highly orthodox and edifying: nothing in the world to be objected to either. But now, notice the Ambrosian. After reading for the prophecy the account of S. Stephen's martyrdom, (for its prophecy the Mozarabic has a lection from Wisdom,) for its epistle, 2 Timothy iv. 1—8, with reference to the 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course,' of the Apostle, the Gospel contains the last five verses of the seventeenth chapter of S. Matthew; the account of the demand made on S. Peter for tribute-money, and the miraculous way in which the fisher of men was instructed to meet it. Why? Because, in 'the fish that first cometh up,' we have a symbolical representation of S. Stephen: fishes, according to the well-known and most ancient interpretation, symbolising Christians; and he coming up the first, with his offering out of the great sea of this world,—an offering itself stamped with the image of the King.

It would be unpardonable not to allude to the service on Easter Eve. That most noble of anthems, the *Exultet jam Angelica turba*, is the same in the Ambrosian as it is in the Roman service, down to the *Sursum Corda*. It then continues

thus: and it would hardly be possible to find, in any church, a more rapturous piece of devotion.

'It is meet and right, just and salutary, that we should always, here and everywhere, render thanks to Thee, holy LORD, Almighty FATHER, Eternal GOD. Who didst Thyself dedicate the Passover of all people, not by the blood and fat of oxen, but by the Body and Blood of Thine Only-Begotten SON JESUS CHRIST, that the sacrificial rites of an ungrateful nation having been terminated, grace might succeed to the law, and One Victim, offered by Himself once for all to Thy Majesty, might expiate the sins of the whole world. This is the Lamb, prefigured in the tablets of stone; not lost from the flock, but exiled from heaven; not lacking a shepherd, but the Good Shepherd Himself, who laid down His life for His sheep, and took it again, that 'o us His divine condescension might manifest His humility, and the Resurrection of His Body might confirm our hope. Who before His shearer uttered no querulous complaint, but proclaimed the oracle of the Gospel, saying: Henceforth ye shall see the SON of MAN, sitting at the Right Hand of Majesty. May He both reconcile Thee to us, O Omnipotent FATHER,<sup>1</sup> and endued with like majesty as Thyself, may He pardon us. For the things which happened to the Fathers in type, the same have been wrought out to us in very deed. [*The great Easter taper is lighted.*] Behold now the fiery column shines forth which preceded the people of the LORD, during the season of this blessed night, to those salutary floods in which the persecutor is overwhelmed, and the people of CHRIST emerges at liberty. For he that through Adam was delivered to death, conceived by the water on which the HOLY GHOST hath brooded, is regenerated by CHRIST to life. Let us then put an end to our voluntary fast, because CHRIST our Passover is sacrificed for us; and let us not only banquet on the flesh of the Lamb, but let us be inebriated with His Blood. For the Blood of this Lamb alone createth not guilt to them that drink it, but salvation. Let us feast on Him the unleavened bread, since man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word of GOD. For this is the bread which cometh down from heaven, far more excellent than that fruitful shower of ancient manna, on which Israel then feasted, and yet nevertheless perished. He who feedeth on This Body shall be the possessor of life eternal. Behold, old things have passed away, all things are become new. The edge of Mosaic circumcision is blunted, and the sharp stones of Joshua the son of Nun have become obsolete; the people of CHRIST is marked in the forehead, not in the loins; by a laver, not by a wound. [*The Deacon fixes the five grains of incense on the Paschal taper.*] In this Advent, then, of the evening resurrection of our LORD and Saviour, it is meet that we should burn our oblation of wax with its whiteness in appearance, its sweetness in odour, its lighted brilliancy to the eye. What more fitting, what more joyous, than that with torches wreathed with flowers we should keep watch for the flower of Jesse? Especially when wisdom hath prophesied concerning herself: I am the flower of the field, and the lily of the valleys. These waxen tapers the burnt pine sweats not forth, nor doth the cedar, wounded by the axe, weep out: but they have a hidden and symbolical teaching regarding virginity, and grow white by the transfiguration of their snowy candour. Let us wait, then, for the coming of the Spouse, as befits the Church, with lighted torches: let us render thanks by our devotion for the gift of sanctity already bestowed on us.'

<sup>1</sup> Notice here the 'unscriptural' expression, which also occurs more than once in the Clementine Liturgy, of reconciling God to us. According to S. Paul's teaching, it is we who are to be reconciled to God.

We must not dwell at greater length on this remarkable address, manifestly coeval with S. Augustine. There are some few expressions in it which a more correct taste has not improperly removed; but to do away with the whole hymn for the sake of them, is on a par with the treatment which Rome has bestowed on many other compositions of equal merit and antiquity.

We have already remarked that the Gospel in the Ambrosian Rite is followed by an *Antiphona post Evangelium*, which, therefore, answers to the *Lauda* of the Mozarabic ritual. There is nothing which calls for much observation in this Antiphon. It is almost always taken from the Psalms: occasionally, on Saints' Days, it is formed from the words of the Saint then commemorated. But when we come to the subsequent part of the service it is that we are painfully conscious of the infinite superiority of Toledo to Milan. In the Mozarabic Missal we have, after the Gospel, nine varying prayers or addresses, for they are as often exhortations to the people as supplications to GOD. They are—(1.) The Missa. (2.) The Alia Oratio. (3.) The Post Nomina. (4.) The Ad Pacem. (5.) The Illation. (6.) The Post Sanctus. (7.) The Post Pridie. (8.) The Prayer before the LORD's Prayer. (9.) The Benediction. And this is exclusive of the Sacrifice, the Ad Accedentes, the Ad Confractionem, and the Communio. In the Ambrosian Rite we have only four prayers posterior to the Gospel, and these far shorter than those we have been noticing. They are—(1.) The Prayer Super Sindonem. (2.) The Super Oblatam. (3.) The Preface. (4.) The Post Communio. Besides this, we have the three anthems: the Offertory, the Transitory, and the Confractory.

The Offertory is remarkable on the following account:—The Church of Milan is the only one in Christendom where the primitive custom of the people's offering the oblations is still kept up. Mr. Webb, in his *Sketches of Continental Ecclesiology*, thus describes the practice:—'After the sermon, some members of a confraternity or Bedesmen, two men and two women, in black and white mantles, brought in an oblation of the elements. They stood at the end of the choir, and the deacon came, with much ceremony, to receive the offerings.' But these 'Bedesmen' are pensioners of the Metropolitan Church itself, and are, therefore, after all, only an imitation of the venerable custom which they professed to represent. There are ten old men, called Vecchioni, and as many old women: two of the former, first covering their hands with favoni, that is, with napkins of a peculiar texture, make their oblation of bread in the right, of wine in the left; then two women do the same. These pensioners have the right of walking in processions, when they carry

the so-called cope and discipline of S. Ambrose. Landulph, the mediæval historian of Milan, describes at great length their office and character: Beroldus, also, though not without some mistakes, does the same. It is this which gives its chief interest to the Offertory. The rite itself, taking it altogether, is not remarkably striking: there is one part which, to unaccustomed eyes, seems singularly awkward: when the Deacon and Sub-deacon stand respectively at the north and south ends of the altar, like two clergymen in a badly-performed English Communion Office. In fact, of the five great living rites, for dignity and majesty, we should place the Ambrosian last. To our mind, the Armenian stands by far the first: next to that, but at some distance, we should place the Mozarabic, then the Roman, then the orthodox Eastern, and then, far below this, the Ambrosian.

The Oratio super Sindonem bears far more the character of a Roman collect than of the longer Mozarabic or Eastern prayers. In fact, sometimes it is the same as the Collect for the day in the Petrine Liturgy: and whether or not, the shortness of the whole composition, and the terseness and antithetical arrangement of its members, stamp it with the same character. The Oratio post Communionem, in like manner, bears the character of the Roman Post-Communio, as also does the Oratio super Oblatam of the Roman Secreta. One remarkable peculiarity, derived from the most remote antiquity, we should not fail to mention: that, on the Epiphany, immediately after the Gospel, but before the Antiphona post Evangelium, the Deacon sings the notice of the ensuing Easter to a peculiar melody, in the Eighth Tone, and in the following words:—‘Noverit caritas vestra, fratres carissimi, quod annuente Dei et Domini nostri JESU CHRISTI misericordia, die N. Mensis N. Pascha Domini cum gaudio celebrabimus.’ And the answer is, ‘Deo gratias.’

Take now one or two examples of Ambrosian Illations: and we will select one which we may compare not alone with the Mozarabic, but also with the Gallican. Here is that for Holy Innocents.

*Ambrosian:—*

‘It is just and salutary that we, Holy, Omnipotent FATHER, should more gloriously laud Thee in the precious death of the little ones: whom, on account of the infancy of Thy Son, our LORD and Saviour, gloomy Herod slew with savage cruelty: and we acknowledge the unbounded gifts of Thy clemency. For Grace alone shines more gloriously than Will; and their confession was illustrious before their voices could be heard. Passion, before the limbs in which that passion could exist: they witnessed CHRIST to others, who as yet knew Him not themselves. O Infinite loving-kindness of the Almighty: when He suffereth not those that were slain for His Name, although they knew it not, to fall short of the merit of eternal glory: but, when they were bedewed with their own blood, they

obtained at once the salvation of regeneration, and were glorified with the Crown of Martyrdom. 'Through the same.'

**Gallican :—**

'It is verily meet and right that we should at all times and in all places render thanks to Thee, Holy LORD, Omnipotent FATHER, Eternal GOD, and chiefly for those, the memory of whose Passion we celebrate in the yearly festival of to-day: those whom the Herodian soldiers dashed from the breasts of their nursing mothers, who of a truth are called the flowers of martyrs, for that they, springing up in the mid-winter of infidelity, were like the first budding gems of the Church, nipped by the frost of persecution, at that glittering fountain in the city of Bethlehem. For the Infants, who could not, through their age, speak, nevertheless resounded the praise of the LORD with joy. They preached that by their deaths, which they could not have preached by their lives. They uttered that with their blood which they could not proclaim by their tongue. Martyrdom gave them the power of praise, to whom infancy had not yet allowed the faculty of utterance. The Infant CHRIST sends these infants as first-fruits to heaven, transmits these new year's gifts to the FATHER: exhibits to the Eternal One the first martyrdoms of the little children perpetrated by the wickedness of Herod, as firstling oblations. The enemy profits, while injuring, the body: bestows a benefit by means of slaughter: by dying they live, by falling they rise again: victory is brought to pass by means of destruction. Wherefore for these benefits, and for the present solemnity, tendering, rather than repaying, boundless thanks to Thy loving-kindness, with holy Angels and Archangels, we laud Thee, as the One GOD, the Ruler, distinct, not divided, triune, not threefold, sole, not solitary, saying, Holy.

**Mozarabic :—**

'It is meet and right that we should always render thanks to Thee, Almighty FATHER, and to JESUS CHRIST our LORD, the infancy of whose assumed humanity that wicked and profane king feared after such a sort that he was compelled to tremble at that power whom he merited not to acknowledge. Desiring that He specially should perish, and ignorant where He was to be found, Herod commanded that all the infants should be slain: if perchance, while the members were struck, the Head might be reached: and the deaths of the poor might be the structure which should be topped by the royal death. Thus the madness of deceived fury made those martyrs by death, who by their age were not capable of being even confessors. And when there was no possibility of judgment, there was, nevertheless, the felicity of being unjustly judged for CHRIST's sake. It was CHRIST, then, whom the hand of the officer struck in the dying infants: ignorance found not Him Whom it saw; and imprudence discerned not Him Whom it struck. But that these infants could not speak is no derogation from their praise. For it is better that the cause should cry out, than that the tongue should exclaim. Nor does it matter that speech failed them, who, without all manner of doubt, perished for the Word. O immunity of wicked fury! He who was slain, was carried on the sword that killed him, and the tender corpse hung on the hilt, pouring forth milk rather than blood. And they who could not then discern that for which they thirsted, now possess in joy that from which they may drink. Whence meetly to Thee, O LORD, all the Angels cease not to exclaim, thus saying: Holy.'

It would be easy to extend our remarks on these Illations; but our space warns us to conclude. The two anthems called the Transitory and the Confractory present but little for our

special notice. As a general rule, they are connected with the Gospel for the Sunday: and the same are usually said through the week. In some cases, the Transitory is merely a translation of some Greek Troparion; another proof of the closeness of the link by which Milan was joined to the East. Take this, for example, for Quinquagesima: it is neither more nor less than a translation of a Stichos in the Sunday of the Pharisee and Publican:—

‘Come and be converted to Me, saith the LORD. Come ye with weeping, and let us pour forth our tears to GOD: for we have forsaken Him, and because of us the earth suffers; we have committed iniquity, and for our sakes the foundations of the world are moved. Let us hasten to prevent the anger of GOD, weeping, and saying: Thou That takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.’

Sometimes it is a mere quotation from the writings of S. Ambrose, as in the Sunday of Abraham: ‘Look, O Lord, at the frailty of the human race, and seek out the wounds which Thou hast cured. For, however great be the love that Thou hast poured out upon us, there are yet further mercies which Thou mayest bestow upon us. Stretch forth, we beseech Thee, Thy medicinal hands, and cure that which is weak, and repair that which is tottering, and preserve that whole where faith remains unshaken.’ In some few cases the Transitory seems to be composed for the occasion, as in the Sixth Sunday after Epiphany:—‘Turn ye, O ye sons of men, while ye have time, saith the Lord; and I will write your names in the book of My Father which is in heaven.’

The *Oratio Post Communionem*, answering to the Latin Post-Communion, often identical with it, is the only other prayer which has to be noticed. That over, the office ends thus:—

V. The LORD be with you.

R. And with thy spirit. Kyr. Kyr. Kyr.

V. The LORD bless and hear us.

R. Amen.

V. Let us go on in peace.

R. In the NAME of the LORD. Amen.

And the service now borrows the Roman ending from the first chapter of S. John.

At Christmas, and at Easter and Pentecost, there are two sets of masses; one for the recently baptized in the winter Church, the other the ordinary solemnity. Much that was peculiar to the Ambrosian Rite disappeared during the Pontificate of S. Charles Borromeo, who did almost as much harm to the ritual as he increased the piety of his Church. Till his time, that noble Basilic, which may put in a claim to be the finest of



all temples made with hands, had but one altar: it was he who filled it up with the erections which now so sadly violate the magnificent unity of the effect.

Thus we have gone through the three great Rites of the Western Church. Of these the Ambrosian seems to us the poorest, inferior to the marvellous copiousness and richness and variety of the Mozarabic, inferior to the terseness and pointed brevity of the Roman. Such as it is, however, it is well worthy of study; and, as we have seen, one or two of its formulæ possess an antiquity superior to that which can be boasted by any other ritual.

ART. V.—*L'Union Chrétienne. Journal Hebdomadaire, paraissant tous les dimanches.* Bureaux de Rédaction et d'Administration, 5, Rue Coq-Héron, Paris.

WE desire to call attention to this new effort of the Gallican party in Paris. We have already more than once noticed the *Observateur Catholique*, which is *par excellence* the Gallican periodical organ. This journal is still continuing on its useful course, and has lately contained a series of papers very interesting to English readers, being a review of the French translation of Mr. Massingberd's History of the Reformation, written by the learned and candid author of the *Histoire de l'Eglise de France*, the Abbé Guettée. The present journal is conducted on the same principles as the *Observateur Catholique*, but with a different purpose. The object of the *Observateur Catholique* is, we presume, to maintain the old traditions of the French Church, as represented by Bossuet, against the flood of Ultramontane innovation which is everywhere striving to remove its neighbours' and its ancestors' landmarks, and to reduce everything to a dead uniformity with Rome. The object of the *Union Chrétienne* shall be stated in its own words. The following is the prospectus issued by the Editors:—

'The founders of this new religious journal belong to different Christian Communions, but they are united in the same worship of the Word of God and in the same love for the Church of Christ.

'Deeply afflicted at the schism which exists between the different branches of the Church, and at the misapprehensions, mistakes, and prejudices which keep up this division, we propose to ourselves the task of removing these mistakes, prejudices, and misapprehensions, and of preparing the way for a holy union amongst all those who bear the name of Christian.

'This work of peace cannot but receive the blessing of HIM who died for the purpose of abolishing all divisions among men, and of uniting minds in truth and hearts in charity.

'We think that the best way of arriving at our object will be to disentangle revealed religious truth from everything which is not revealed, by means of study and discussion on the Holy Scriptures and on the works which remain to us of the first Christian ages. We must in this way arrive at the Apostolical teaching, such as it was accepted by all the branches of the Christian Church previous to their separation.

'We feel sure that merely presenting the doctrine of Jesus Christ thus, in its *purity and integrity*, will be enough to attach to it the affections of all honest-hearted Christians.

'There are, thank God, very many such Christians, but they find themselves isolated,—lost as it were in the midst of the indifferent mass which constitutes the majority of men in all Churches. We know that they are anxious for an organ to serve as a centre and bond of union.

'We desire to answer to their wishes in founding the *Union Chrétienne*.

'There will be published in it learned and grave articles on all questions of interest to religious men; our readers will be kept *au courant* with the theological, historical, and philosophical discussions which are agitated in the bosom of the several Churches; special attention will be paid to the questions which have brought about the separation of these Churches; everything which takes place connected with religion, that is worthy of notice, will be registered. The ruling idea, as we have said, throughout, will be that of disentangling revealed religious truth from all systems of men, the doctrines of Christ from the opinions and prejudices which are too often confounded with them.

'We invite all of our brethren in Jesus Christ, who, like ourselves, aspire to union, to take part in this work. We shall not be exclusive. We shall accept with sympathy everything addressed to us which is written in an earnest spirit. We wish our journal to be as a centre where all the rays of mind which are enlightened by faith converge.

'By means of the communications which we shall receive from the most intelligent members of the different Christian Churches, a better understanding will be come to about the disputes which have served as the excuse for their separation. Misunderstandings will disappear by little and little; questions will take their place better; light will fall of itself on the flock of the Lord. From thence will follow a work of unity, the stronger and more irresistible that it will be from within and unintermittent, and will owe nothing to diplomatic talent.

'Those who desire to support us with their sympathies may rest assured that the new religious journal which we are founding will never be allowed to become a speculation, but will always show itself worthy of their support by the firm attitude which it will assume, by its fairness, and by its high-minded independence.'<sup>1</sup>

This prospectus speaks for itself. We see nothing in it which an English Churchman might not have written, and nothing in which an English Churchman may not heartily sympathise. It is charitable and fair-spoken. There is no arrogance about it—no assumption. It in effect acknowledges that the Pope is not the centre of unity to the Church, nor the means of gathering divided Christians into unity. Its appeal is to Holy Scripture and antiquity. It shows, indeed, that it is but a narrow (though, alas! a deep) channel which parts the Gallican from the Anglican Churchman.

The introductory article in the first number is written in the same spirit as the prospectus. It is headed 'General Considerations on the object which the founders of the *Union Chrétienne* place before themselves.' We cannot better explain the purpose of the proposed movement than by quoting largely from this article.

<sup>1</sup> To this prospectus there is added a note to the effect that the *Union Chrétienne* will appear weekly, beginning on the 6th of November last, and that persons desirous of subscribing should write to *M. le Directeur de l'Union Chrétienne, 5, Rue Coq-Héron, Paris*. The price to subscribers in England, including postage, is thirty francs, or twenty-five shillings for the year, payable through a banker or a bookseller, or in any other way.

'The *Union Chrétienne* has been founded to serve as a centre and organ for true Christians, who wish to labour in the work of bringing about Religious Unity, which our Lord Jesus Christ came to found on the earth.

'This unity did exist in the first ages of Christianity, but since the separation of the Churches that community of belief and opinion, which in the purpose of our Lord and Master ought to be the final result of His teaching and sacrifice, has been no longer seen.

'The Christian world is not united; discord, antipathy, and hatred reign between the different Christian Churches. Even in those communions which boast most of their unity, one sees an almost infinite number of sectaries, who form parties, or, if you will, schools. These schools differ on the most fundamental questions; they do not observe any rules of charity towards each other; so that they are really as much divided as the different Churches themselves.

'But over and above the sectaries and the partisans, in every Church there are found men deeply religious, wise, and learned, who groan over the discords of which the Christian world is the theatre, and aspire after the blessed time when the prayer of the Lord will be accomplished:—

"Holy Father," said the Saviour, on the eve of quitting the world, "Holy Father, I pray not for these alone, but for those who shall believe on Me through their word, that they all may be *one*, as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be *one* in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." (John xvii. 21.)

'Thus union between Christians is the sign which Christ gives of his divine mission. It is by means of it that the work of revelation and redemption is to be accomplished; it is this union which was predicted by the angels of the Lord when they announced the birth of the Man-God—"Glory to God in the highest! Peace upon earth; goodwill amongst men." (Luke ii. 14.)<sup>1</sup>

'To labour for peace and union is therefore to take part in a divine work.

'Members of different Christian Churches, who are convinced of this truth and united in sentiment, have undertaken to concentrate their efforts with a view to bringing together those who believe in Christ; to do away with the barriers which keep apart so many men who deserve to understand each other, and ought no longer to be the victims of error or prejudice.

'To reach this end they have chosen as the first means the foundation of a journal specially intended to discuss the questions which at present divide Christian Churches, and to expound religious truth with exactness and precision as it has been revealed.

'One of the principal obstacles to union is the different sense attached by different persons to the word *Church*. We shall take particular care in our examination of this preliminary question. . . .

'The word *Catholic* has been tortured into every kind of meaning. The only sense which the ancient Christian Church assigned to it is that of S. Papias. The *Catholic* then is the *Complete Christian*. To be a Catholic and to belong to the true Church of Christ, it is enough to accept revealed religious truth without taking away from it or adding thereto, such as it was accepted by the Apostolic and Universal Church.

'Those who add to this revealed truth or diminish from it are not Catholics, to whatever Church they may belong. Those who accept it in its purity are Catholics and children of the true Church of Christ, in whatever ecclesiastical communion they have been born.

<sup>1</sup> This text and that of S. John, just quoted, are adopted as the mottoes of the *Union Chrétienne*.

'Diversities in Churches cannot be barriers to the union of the children of God. They belong to the circumstances and manners of different peoples and times. Provided that the variety which results therefrom is not injurious either to morality or to the faith or to the essential constitution of the Church, it ought to be all the more respected, because without it the very establishment of Christianity would for some countries be altogether impossible, and the unity of the Church would be a Utopia.

'Those, then, who accept in its completeness the doctrine of Christ are Catholics and true Christians, however much they may differ with respect to ceremonies, which are dependent on the character of different nations. What matters the form, so that the foundation is the same? The foundation is divine, the form is human. To confound them together is to make a heterogeneous mixture of the divine and the human, to raise insuperable barriers between man and man, and to render the work of Christ impossible.

'To distinguish that which comes from God from that which has been established by men, our rule will be Holy Scripture studied, examined, and interpreted in an honest and candid spirit. When the doctrinal meaning of a text is called in question, we shall prefer to our own judgment the interpretation of the Church, such as it will be shown to be from the concurrent witness of all the Apostolic Churches. That is the rule which was in use from the beginning of Christianity. We cannot employ this rule of the Catholic Faith without meeting with two sorts of adversaries.' . . .

These adversaries are explained to be the Individualists on one side, who do not sufficiently regard the *croissance collective* and the *témoignage permanent et universel* of the Church; and on the other the Absolutists, who dishonour the principle of authority by confounding it with blind submission, and in whose eyes annihilation of the intellect is the generation of order and faith—in other words, the Ultramontanists, whom the writer expects to find his bitterest foes and calumniators.

The following passage in the same paper is worthy of notice:—

'We shall examine into the origin and reason of the Papal Power by the help of the monuments of ecclesiastical history and ecclesiastical law. In reducing this power to its *legal and canonical* bounds, we shall destroy one of the greatest obstacles to the union of the Christian Churches, one of the most direct causes of the internal divisions which exist amongst Christians.'

—P. 3.

The writer continues to repudiate, on the part of himself and his *collaborateurs*, the thought of setting up altar against altar, or instituting a new Church. He re-affirms that their object is to spread abroad the good seeds of revealed religious Truth, pure from all human accretion and in its fulness: that they address themselves to religious and honest-hearted men who are anxious to possess the Truth of Christ in its completeness; that they wish to confirm those who are in possession of this Truth, to enlighten those who are deceived, to receive enlightenment themselves, to offer the friends of Truth a means of communicating with each other, east speaking through their columns to west, and north to south: and a promise is given that all communications shall be admitted which are worthy of publication.

We must make one more extract from this manifesto, long as our quotations have already been:—

‘It cannot be concealed that everywhere men feel the need of religious union. In all Christian Churches we see a work of fusion going on, or rather an attempt at it. But these efforts are not crowned with success.

‘In the Roman Church those who are working for unity confound unity with uniformity. . . .

‘The Greek Church, so venerable in many respects in spite of too strong a tendency towards subtle and scholastic discussions, has been by unhappy circumstances subjected to the yoke of Islam, and has undergone the sad consequences of slavery. Sound in its faith, it has fallen with respect to its institutions into a kind of *atonie*, which necessarily follows from slavery. Almost isolated from the Occidental Churches, prejudiced against some Oriental Churches, she has not found in herself the elements of active life and intellectual progress. Russia, which belongs to this ancient Church, seems to be called by Providence to make her belief known and to stimulate her religious activity. . . .

‘Protestantism seeks to group its scattered members in an Evangelical Alliance, and even opens the gate of this Alliance to the members of other Churches. But the different branches of Protestantism are divided amongst themselves, and from the other Christian Churches, on too many important points for them to be able to be really united in the maintenance of all their special doctrines.

‘The Anglican Church, so important for the number of its children, and for the learned labours of its theologians, feels, like all the rest, the need of union; and at the same time finds itself deeply divided. While one portion of its clergy manifests tendencies towards the Roman Church, the other throws itself back into Protestantism. All desire to be united in the Truth, and they are more divided than ever.

‘Everywhere we see internal quarrels arising from tendencies to union in different forms.’—P. 5.

With these and other like words the Abbé Guettée, who signs himself *Prêtre de l'Eglise Catholique, du rit latin*, launches forth the first number of the new periodical in the name of the committee of management. He is followed by Ab-Youssouf, who designates himself as *Prêtre de l'Eglise Catholique, du rit oriental*, in a paper written in the same spirit and declaring the work of the journal to be that of ‘sowing in the world the good seed of union in charity and truth.’ The rest of the number is taken up by a *Chronique* of religious events, and by a short article declaring that while the first object of the Editors is to work for the union of the Churches by theological and historical discussions of religious questions, they shall, in addition, employ themselves in defending Christianity against the attacks directed against it by Deism and Rationalism in the philosophical writings of the day.

This last announcement is important, as showing the spirit in which the work is conducted. The movement is no product of French Liberalism desirous of casting off Christian Truth, or secretly doubting whether Truth exists. It does not spring



from a hope of combining in negatives, but of uniting in positive Christian Truth. Our eyes have long watched for such a movement, and have grown weary in watching. God grant that it may prosper now!

We shall not detail the contents of the other eight numbers which have appeared up to the date of our publication with the same minuteness. The following are the headings of some of the articles:—‘Principles of Christian Union’ (p. 9), ‘On ‘Christian Tolerance’ (p. 11), ‘The results of quarrels within ‘the Church’ (p. 17), ‘The Armenian Church’<sup>1</sup> (p. 20), ‘Is

<sup>1</sup> The French, who, on political motives, are the strongest possible Roman Catholic Propagandists in the East, have been striving for a length of time to bring over the Armenians to the Latin Communion by offering them French protection and temporal advantages on their compliance. They have partially succeeded. On the other hand another part of the Armenian Church looks back to the Orthodox Church with more friendly eyes than heretofore. In one of the last copies of the *Armenian Punch* (for there is an *Armenian ‘Punch’*) there appeared an illustration representing the struggle which has been going on in the district of Karpout, between the National Armenians and the Romanists. On the left there is a church-door marked Armenia; on the right another marked Rome. In the centre there is a parcel of children in a swing or basket, which is oscillating between the two doors. At each door there are priests with outstretched hands, and at the bottom there is written, ‘We shall soon see who will catch the cords of the swing.’ The faces of the Romanist priests are beaming with eagerness and confidence; those of the National Armenian priests marked with ineffable disgust and chagrin. The following extract from the *Byzantis*, the Orthodox Greek Church newspaper, published at Constantinople, of the date of November 11th last, will be interesting to our readers as showing the approximation of the Orthodox and Armenian Communions:—

Τὴν παρελθούσαν δευτέραν ἡ Α. Μακ. ὁ πατριάρχης τῶν Ἀρμενίων Κ. Κιβόρχ μετέβη μετὰ πολλῆς συνοδείας καὶ παρατάξεως εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερα Πατριαρχεῖα πρὸς ἐπίσκεψιν τῆς Α. Π. τοῦ Πατριάρχου. Ἡ Α. Π. μετὰ τῆς ἱερᾶς Συνόδου ἐδέχθη τὰς Α. Μ. εἰς τὴν θύραν τῶν Συνοδικῶν ὅπου ἔκαμον τὸν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀσπασμὸν, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐγένοντο εἰς τὴν Α. Μ. αἱ δέουσαι περιποιήσεις, καὶ μετὰ συνδιαλέξιν διαρκέσασαν ἐπὶ ἰκανῇ ὥρᾳ, ἀναχωρῶν ἡ Α. Μ. ὁ πατριάρχης Κύριος Κιβόρχ κατέβη εἰς τὸν πατριαρχικὸν ναὸν, προπορευομένων τῶν ἡμετέρων ἱερέων ἐν στολῇ, ὅπου τοὺς ὑπεδέχθησαν διὰ τοῦ “ἄξιον ἐστίν.” Ἀκολουθῶς εἰσελθὼν ἡσπόσθη τὰς ἁγίας εἰκόνας καὶ τὸ λείψανον τῆς ἁγίας Εὐφημίας καὶ ἁγίας Θεοφανοῦς, μεθ’ ὃ ἡ Α. Μ. προσελθούσα εἰς τὰ δημόδια ἔκαμεν αἴτησιν Ἀρμενιστὶ, οἱ δὲ ψάλλται ἔψαλον τὸ “εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη Δέσποτα,” καὶ ἡ Α. Μ. ὑλόγησε τοὺς περιστώτας. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἡ Α. Μ. ἀπῆλθε διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ πάλιν παρατάξεως.

Ἡ φαινομένη καλὴ ἁρμονία μεταξὺ τῶν ἀρχηγῶν τῶν δύο Ἐκκλησιῶν θεωρεῖται παρ’ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἐθνῶν μετὰ πλείστης εὐαρεσκείας. Πολλάκις τῶντοι ἐγένοντο ἀπόπειραι ἐκ μέρους τῶν Ἀρμενίων πρὸς ἔνωσιν τῶν δύο Ἐκκλησιῶν, αἷτινες δὲν διαφέρουσιν οὔτε κατὰ τὰ δόγματα οὔτε κατὰ τὰς θρησκευτικὰς δοξασίας. Αἱ πρὸ ἐτῶν γεγνησιν ἀπόπειραι αὗται ἀπέτυχον δυστυχῶς ἵσως ἐνεκα ὑπερμέτρου θρησκευτικοῦ ἕλλου τῶν ἡμετέρων, οἷτινες δεικνύουσιν ἐπιμονὴν εἰς μερικότητάς τινας ἀσημάντους. Τοιοῦτοτρόπως δὲν ἀναγνωρίζει ἡ ἡμέτερα Ἐκκλησία τὸ βάπτισμα τῶν Ἀρμενίων, μολονδὶ γίνεται κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ὅπως διατίτουνσιν οἱ ἱεροὶ κανόνες.

Εὐχῆς ἔργον ἤθελεν εἶσθαι ἀμφοτέραι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι νὰ ἔλθωσιν εἰς εὐλόγους παραωρήσεις καὶ νὰ φέρωσιν εἰς ἔνωσιν τὰς δύο ἐκκλησίας, μετὰ τῶν ὁποίων οὐδεμία ὑπάρχει δογματικὴ ἢ κανονικὴ διαφορὰ, καὶ εἰς ἣν ἀνήκουσι δύο ἔθνη τὰ πολυπληθέστερα καὶ τὰ μᾶλλον ἀνεπτυγμένα ἠθικῶς τε καὶ υἱικῶς ἐνὸς καὶ τοῦ

'the present a favourable time for the Union of all Christians?' (p. 25), 'Some Counsels of Christian Charity for the Union of the Churches' (p. 28), 'Protestant Propaganda in Italy' (p. 30), 'On the Church of Christ' (p. 33), 'On the Study of Holy Scripture, and especially of the New Testament, as a means of Reformation and Union' (p. 35). The signatures generally given are those of the Abbé Guettée as a Latin priest, and Ab-Youssouf as a Greek priest. We need not be surprised at not seeing other French priests' names, as, however much they may sympathise with the cause, and even write in the journal, they cannot sign the articles. It requires a man with the moral courage of M. Guettée to dare to compromise himself with his superiors, and to bring down upon himself the excommunication of the *Univers*, an excommunication which in most cases involves the loss of bread. The names of laymen belonging both to the Western and the Eastern communion appear. In the seventh number we notice a warm-hearted letter from the Rev. P. G. Medd, of University College, Oxford, who signs himself as *Prêtre de l'Eglise Catholique, du rite anglican*. The conductors of the Anglo-Continental Society have, it would appear, been invited to insert communications touching the belief and position of the English Church.

The extract given above, relative to the English Church, shows a greater appreciation of the true character of the Anglican Church than that which we should have been likely to have met with some years ago. The writer shows himself conscious of the difference which exists between Anglicanism and mere Protestantism, and the same consciousness appears throughout the journal. The following passage is noticeable for the fairness of the spirit displayed in it towards the Oriental and the Anglican Churches, and for the distinction which it draws between Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, and Protestantism. It is on the subject of the seat of Church authority and Holy Orders:—

'The Ultramontane theory of Church government belongs to a fraction of the Roman Catholic Church. It is at present openly favoured by the Court of Rome, which is anxious to propagate it throughout the Church. Nevertheless, the Ultramontane opinion has met with numerous opponents in the bosom of the Latin Church. The Church of France, or the Gallican Church, has always protested against pontifical Absolutism. Recognising the Pope as the first Bishop of the Church, and attributing to him superior prerogatives to those of the other members of the Episcopate, it would

αὐτοῦ τόπου καὶ ὑπαγόμενα ὑπὸ τὸ σκήπτρον τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνακτος. Ἡ ἐνωσις τῶν δύο τούτων Ἐκκλησιῶν ἤθελεν εἶναι μᾶλλον συνδέσει τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν καλὴν ἁρμονίαν καὶ τὴν συμπάθειαν μεταξὺ τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ ἰδρύνει ἐπὶ βάσει ἀκραδάντων τὴν ὀλικὴν εὐημερίαν ἀμφοτέρων διὰ τῆς πολλαπλασιαστικῆς τῶν μεταξὺ τῶν συναλλαγῶν.

never allow more than a spiritual power in him, and that power limited by law or canon, and subordinate to the authority of the Episcopate. . . . Thus far Gallicans and Ultramontanes agree, viz.—in considering Bishops enjoy their authority in virtue of a sacrament, that is to say, a religious act, a divine institution, which confers on them a sacred character, and which thus makes them derive their authority from God.

'All the Catholic Churches of the East, the chief of which are the Greek and the Armenian, agree in this with the Catholic Churches of the West. The Oriental Churches recognise the Pope as the first Patriarch, that is, the first Bishop of the Universal Church. Their belief with respect to his authority has been determined by the first œcumenical councils. The decrees of those great assemblies, at which alone the Eastern and Western Churches have been represented, formed a universal ecclesiastical law at the time of the separation. This law has been modified in the West, with regard to the Papacy, the titles and prerogatives of which have been extended by the Latin Church; but we may remark that these modifications are institutions of a purely disciplinary nature, and that for essential doctrine, that is to say, with respect to the seat of Church authority, the Oriental Churches are in perfect agreement with the Gallican Church, with the ancient Church of Africa, and with the other Churches of the Patriarchate of the West anterior to the seventeenth century. Their common belief, then, should be regarded as the true *Catholic* belief, which must be carefully distinguished from Ultramontane opinion:

'We notice in the bosom of Protestantism two Churches which profess an intermediate doctrine between the Catholic belief and the different opinions which are radically Protestant. These are the Churches of England and Sweden. Both of them are governed by Bishops, and recognise in these Bishops a particular character resulting from their ordination, and conferring upon them authority for governing the Church. That which distinguishes their belief from that of the Eastern and Gallican Churches is, that they do not regard ordination as a sacrament properly so called, that is to say, as being of divine institution, and that they only make of it a ceremony, ancient, respectable, apostolical, but of ecclesiastical institution. On all other points, the Anglican and Scottish Churches allow to Bishops an authority analogous to that which the Catholic Churches of the East and West recognise in them.

'The Protestant Presbyterian Churches only differ from the Episcopal in this, that they recognise in Presbyters the right which the others give to Bishops. According to the Catholic Churches, and to the Protestant Episcopal Churches, priests have only a delegated authority; they are only vicars of the Bishops, and do not constitute an authority in the Church of Christ. Presbyterians only allow of one authority, that which results from ordination: all presbyters therefore enjoy it. And Bishops can only be priests invested with superior prerogatives for the *surveillance* of the Churches—prerogatives of ecclesiastical right, of a disciplinary nature, which do not confer upon them a power essentially superior to that of simple priests.

'Amongst all these opinions or beliefs there is a point of union. It is, that Christ has established in his Church an authority for governing and guiding the faithful in the way of salvation, and that this authority is conferred by means of an ordination which gives a particular stamp to him who receives it.

'Protestants, properly so called, do not admit this doctrine. They only see the faithful in the Church. Elders, ministers, all the dignitaries of the Church, are but delegates of the faithful: the authority which they enjoy emanates from them: the prayers which accompany their appointment to

the ministry are only a pious ceremony, and do not confer upon them anything which really distinguishes them from the faithful laity.

'Putting aside the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches of which we have spoken, all Protestantism agrees in this, that there is no authority, properly so called, in the Church, apart from the body of the faithful. All the other Churches, on the contrary, regard this authority as of divine institution, though they differ on the nature and value of ordination.'—P. 35.

'Protestants, properly so called,' and 'the Anglican Church,' are here distinguished in a way which is new as coming from a Roman Catholic writer. The above extract will also serve as a specimen of the calm and argumentative manner in which M. Guettée conducts his researches.

There was a time when the thought of Church Unity used to stir men's hearts amongst us, and to touch a chord to which a response was readily returned. Is that time passed away? True it is that Church Unity has been made a cry by some who have meant little by it but an excuse for disloyalty towards their mother-Church. True that some, far more earnest and far better men than those to whom we have last referred, have been beguiled by the idea into unrealities, and have forced themselves into a belief and declaration that things amongst ourselves are totally different from what they really are, for the sake of representing to themselves and to others that a factitious unity exists where it exists not. True that some, in their search after Unity, have been led into the lamentable error of throwing themselves at the feet of the Pope, and asking him to be their centre and bond to make them one, 'when the Lord their God was their King.' And these too patent evils, which have resulted from the yearning after Unity, have caused us to grow weary of the very name. Men judge by consequences; and if these are the consequences, they say, let us hear no more of it. We know that a preacher who offered himself as a candidate for the Bampton lectureship, and would have been likely to have delivered good lectures, was rejected because he selected so unpropitious a subject as Unity. It is natural. In this, as well as other things, Churchmen must suffer for the errors and wrong-doings of those who have been, or in the popular estimation are still, associated with them. It is natural. But yet Christ's prayer for Unity remains. Our Master's last loving words inculcating Unity remain. The apostolic injunctions on Unity remain. The aspirations of the highest and noblest hearts in all ages of the Church have been for Unity. The best and holiest of our English divines have ever yearned for Unity. The Church of England prays entreatingly and almost with wailing for Unity. Surely we must long, and pray, and work for Unity if we are true Christians.

But what sort of Unity? and on what principles? Not the narrow dull Unity of the Ultramontane, and, with few exceptions, of the whole Roman Catholic Church, which substitutes the Western Patriarch for Christ, as the centre of Unity to all Christians, the bond of union amongst the faithful, and the corner-stone of the Church; which gathers men around one of the captains of the great army, and bids them denounce war and havoc on all the other companies which equally with them constitute the one whole; and which in place of the internal cohesion of the Spirit of Love, seeks for a compulsory uniformity of ecclesiastical institution, discipline, and ritual. Not the vague, negative, meaningless Unity which the Evangelical Alliance and its supporters are blindly seeking after, which ignores the framework of the Church, and must, if successful at all, come to be little else than agreement in essential differences. But the Unity which is not a Utopia, which has existed and may exist again, the Unity of the Church such as it exhibited itself in the primitive Church, when the spirit of love reigned throughout the body and formed the internal bond of cohesion, while a federal union between the great Patriarchates and 'Diocesan' Churches as they were then called (*national* Churches as they would be called now) formed the external links of part to part. The great cause of the overthrow of this Unity was the ambition of Rome, which was not contented with her place in the body, but would be the head, and assume the place which belonged to her Lord. The first step towards Unity must be a recognition that neither the Pope of Rome, nor the Patriarch of Constantinople, nor the Archbishop of Canterbury, nor any one bishop, wheresoever situated, is or can be the axis round which the wheel revolves; that east and west, north and south, Romanists, Orientals, Anglicans, Protestants, are all of the Church, as holding to Christ the Head over all; that amongst these, so different in many respects, *uniformity* is neither to be expected nor desired; that their *unity* must be a unity in the Truth as it is revealed in Holy Scripture and testified to by the Church, and in Love spread abroad throughout the members from Christ the Head; that their *union* must be the federal union which did bind the Church together as long as it remained one. The recognition of this theory, we say, is the first step towards Church Unity; and then follows the work of realizing it.

Almost for the first time, we have seen on the part of a pious, and learned, and courageous Roman Catholic priest, a reaching out after this conception, and an attempt at realizing it. We congratulate the Anglo-Continental Society on this the most legitimate and most satisfactory response which could have been

given to their appeal to their Continental brethren. The primary object, no doubt, of the latter Society is the spreading abroad a knowledge of what the English Church and her doctrine are, but a further object is the union of Christendom 'on the principles of the Anglican Church, which are also the principles of the primitive Church.' The object of M. Guettée and his *collaborateurs* is also the union of Christendom on the principles of the primitive Church, in contradistinction to those of Ultramontanism and of religious Liberalism. The articles in the *Union Chrétienne* could not have been written by an Ultramontane, and could not have been written by a religious Liberal; but there is scarcely a sentence throughout them with which a loyal-hearted Anglican Churchman could not agree. May we not expect a similar movement in Germany? in Sweden? in the East? 'In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withdraw not thy hand, for thou knowest not whether may prosper, either this or that, or whether they both may be alike good.'

France has given much to Christendom. She has given us the Benedictine editions of the Fathers; she has given us the Port Royalists; she has given us Bossuet. If from her shall go forth a movement the result of which shall be to unite the severed Churches in the unity of the Truth and of Love, we shall have more reason to thank her than for any other work that she shall have accomplished or for any idea which has emanated from her.

---



ART. VI.—1. *Realities of Paris Life*. London: Hurst and Blackett. 1859.

2. *Flemish Interiors*. London: Longman.

3. *A Glance behind the Grilles of Religious Houses*. London: Edward Lumley.

OUR idea of 'a convert' has to go through many modifications as experience matures. In our youth it implied previous intense solitary conflict; a struggle, long anxious thought, all the resources of reason brought to bear on one agonizing question. However far we might differ from the conclusion, we assumed a hard single-handed fight with doubts and difficulties; and took for granted that there must necessarily have been conscientious effort to arrive at truth, and an honest attempt to face all the bearings of the momentous subject, in the individual's own proper person. In the act of leaving the Church of our fathers there seemed no escape from private judgment. In transferring ourselves to a new allegiance, no human mind could think for us, we could lean on no human arm, we must cross the bridge alone.

The 'convert,' in abandoning all the light of association and tradition, his early teachers, his first impressions, the home of his prayers, the soul's long refuge, was leaving authority behind, and arrogating the full mastership over himself. To accept at this juncture the workings and conclusions of another mind for his own, would have seemed to us a base surrender of his inherent rights as a rational being. We are speaking now of the mere act of change, which to be worth anything must be an independent act. To go from one system which tells you what to think, to another system which does the same, without the reason being employed in the transaction, implies an enslaved judgment, led by accident, or prejudice, or fancy, but certainly not by conscience. We assumed then that the convert could not blindly enrol himself member of another Church without a very critical self-examination, to make sure that he accepted fully, literally, one by one with all his heart, every article of his new creed; that while forsaking one Church because it taught some points, because it permitted some things, only some, from which he dissented, he could not throw himself into another which made larger demands on his faith, while there was a single article at which he stumbled, to which his mind

opposed doubts. It would not be fair to take anything on trust; he might have done that under the former rule.

No one, we are willing to grant, can arrive at the state of pure impartiality, absolute candour, freedom from prejudice, deliberate judgment, unfettered reason and single absorbing consciousness of a supreme appeal and judge,—a consciousness throwing all other considerations into the shade as though they did not exist,—which seemed to us implied in a change of religion from honest conviction; but nevertheless we believe something like it constitutes every one's abstract ideal, before circumstances call on him to moderate it. No one is prepared beforehand for the amount of physical, material attraction which human influence exercises in these matters. In the abstract it seems absurd that one mind can accept the conclusions of another in unseen spiritual questions without any labour of its own, that it can believe what it never believed before in a moment at another's bidding, that it can contentedly remain in doubt so long as Mr. So-and-So doubts, believing itself to live in the light of God's favour, having no fears, no misgivings; but when Mr. So-and-So's doubts change to certainty, suffer an instant eclipse, as though the light of the divine presence went with him, feeling restless, miserable, forsaken, dark, till it can again borrow its illumination from him. What, we ask, can be the real impressions of this quailing, timid, shivering consciousness as to the nature of the Infinite and All-seeing; the Father of us all? How is it that he allows the domineering shadow of a human intellect to come between him and his Maker? Whom does he accept as his judge? Who understands him best? To whom does he refer his motives, the inmost questionings of his heart? Who alone knows what belief is? Who alone cannot be deceived?

These are questions that cannot, we think, but have arisen, whether quite fairly or not, when we have witnessed, as in years past, a great man 'going over' with his followers, and contrasted the conduct and attitude of his various friends and disciples under the trial. He left some behind, heavy, sorrowful, heartbroken, who in the bitterness of a first parting may even have wished that they could follow him too. But the answer came with stern distinctness, 'I cannot;' and while they could not, the duty was plain, the thought was regarded as a temptation and set aside. Others surely have said resolutely, 'I will try,' not because any new light was thrown upon the question, not because they saw things in a new point of view, but because they felt dull and desolate and bare when left alone. Their intellect had lost a controlling presence, they felt they could not live alone, they could not believe themselves safe or in the right,

now the one human rock and pillar had failed them. Time, and the inevitable experience which time brings, modifies our expectation of absolutely independent action. We cease to wonder at what is common. Men do influence one another in unaccountable ways, nor can we distinctly mark the line where legitimate influence ends. We are of the nature of sheep, and will follow a leader; and this being the case, perhaps the wonder rather is that more have not been so influenced. There is no doubt that the leaders of twelve or fourteen years ago expected a larger retinue of adherents; to which class all that we have said exclusively applies, as alone to the point in our present subject.

In the utter separation which usually follows their desertion,—a separation which circumstances scarcely under the control of either side render inevitable,—we are left much in the dark as to the future course of thought and turn of interests which ‘the converts’ as a body have inherited from their momentous step. We hear now and then of young people trained in the new system turning monks and nuns, and choosing the strictest orders for their profession; but what process of thought and of events has led to a fate so at variance with their early prospects we are left to guess: whether it has been done in the rigour of self-sacrifice, or because the new sphere of action offers no career, or simply as being natural that the points of difference between the old and new system of thought should take the strongest hold, and mould first the character and then the destiny. All persons who act as it seems for conscience’ sake, often to the detriment of their temporal concerns, possess some interest for us; or even when we doubt the reality of that conscientiousness, and suspect mere hero-worship where they assume independent conviction, the weakness is too common to tender natures altogether to alienate our regard. The step need not necessarily produce entire estrangement, unless (as in so many tempers it does) it prompts to outrage in those points where still we might have felt together—unless the original weakness did not extend itself to a defiance and blind repudiation of everything connected with that past from which the idol has separated himself.

The interest (such as they possess) of the series from a convert’s pen, which heads our article, lies in the answer they offer to such speculations and inquiries, as giving us some insight into the motives which in many instances may have first led to a change of communion, the state of mind that attended that change, and the principles and temper which have resulted from it. It perhaps is rather necessarily an unfavourable specimen, for amiable people do not turn upon and expose old

friends, nor would we do such injustice to a class as to attribute to them the extremes that characterise this writer; but we believe her faults to be only the extremes of very common errors, and we cannot but regard her excessive rancour against the Church she has left, and the country towards which she no longer recognises the duty of patriotism, her blind prejudice, her determination to see only the things she wishes to see, and to ignore all that goes against her prepossessions, as betraying what are the tendencies of such a position and how they may develop themselves. We speak of *her* prejudices because, though it suits the writer's plan to speak of herself uniformly as originally a priest of the English Church, it does not need general uncontradicted report to convince every reader of the really feminine origin of these pictures of foreign life; and the purpose for which this disguise was originally adopted—to give weight to opinion, and to imply superior opportunities for forming a judgment—indicates what we believe to be another of the tendencies we have alluded to, that of making strictness and austerity of life a greater test of spirituality than an ingenuous simplicity of conversation and bearing.

This lady's tone leads us to suppose her one of Dr. Manning's conquests, at least she boasts of the irresistible force of his eloquence. She enlarges his European reputation, 'he being more fully appreciated abroad than even in England,' while on hearing him styled 'L'apôtre de l'Angleterre,' she confirms the praise by her testimony; observing, 'that I believed it was often said the refined and winning manners of this distinguished man, combined with a singular vigour and perspicuity of reasoning, and a happy command of language, tended to fascinate many who came within their influence; but though I did not mean to deny him these external gifts, I felt sure that the result was due to his inflexible faith, clear perception of truth, profound knowledge of the human heart, and rather therefore to supernatural than to superficial attractions.' The master must not be made answerable for the disciple; but if, as we may perhaps infer from this passage, the lady's conversion was the immediate result of personal influence, we may class her amongst those who have followed a leader.

Our readers may, perhaps, remember her first work, 'A Glance behind the Grilles of Religious Houses, with a Comparative View of the Working of the Church System Abroad and at Home.' This professed to be written while still a member, and as we have said a priest, of the English Church; to sustain which assumption it is solemnly dedicated 'To my brethren in Christ, the Clergy of the Church of England, in the hope that they will agree with me in admiring the results of that

'unity which (while it is unhappily lost to us) forms the sure and enduring basis of an organization, for the restoration of which among ourselves we should do well to unite in prayer.' This call for united prayer certainly jars on the reader who has previously looked through the pages of the book, as a profanation; for it is invoked to decide a foregone conclusion. The whole design of the work betrays the same turn for subterfuge, and shows a mind dim in its perception of abstract right and wrong, true and false, rendered deliberately disingenuous by the spirit of controversy.

We have quoted this inscription at length, as containing the two ideas which constitute the greatness and the attraction of the Church of Rome to this class of minds, ideas which are in a certain sense independent of that Church's doctrines, and for the sake of which the doctrines have probably been accepted with very slight investigation. These two ideas are asceticism and organization. With this good lady, to associate together for the purposes of walking barefoot and habitually sleeping upright constitutes the triumph of Christianity. She gives details of excessive austerities in the persuasion that they must convince even Protestants of the truth of the whole Papal system. As the greater includes the less; this, embracing as it does the theory of merit, seems to include all doctrine. 'He can't be wrong whose life is in the right.' She may indeed, in the character of an English inquirer, stop now and then to object to a Romish practice, but the first word convinces her. Thus, after hearing a most extravagant sermon from a Trappist monk on the efficacy of prayer to the Virgin—prayer repeated mechanically by a robber and murderer, and which was rewarded by a miraculous interposition in his favour, performed by an image of the Virgin which he passed on his way to the gallows; our authoress, while 'fascinated by the earnestness and energy of the preacher,' states herself to have received the assurance of another Trappist 'that Catholics never pray to the Virgin, but only for her intercession,' with instant, implicit belief. 'Je vous remercie pour cette explication; elle est si nettement posée que je me garderai bien de l'oublier.' Indeed, she assumes throughout that austerity secures enlightenment. And if ascetism means pure faith, organization means in the same degree fervent charity. We are not disputing the existence of fervent charity in France; but here it is the organization which gives the fervour, and we are constantly told that England cannot have the charity because it has not the systematic organization. It is this that makes her so satirical on a married clergy, it interferes so much with organization; it is this that gives such an immense superiority to France over her own

country, for France is the acknowledged country for organization. What praise is not due to a religious system that has a separate *Euvre* for the conversion of mountebanks, and a fraternity for the education of chimney-sweeps? Where do we meet with such things in London? It is no use to reply that we have done away with chimney-sweeps altogether,—that is an act of mere philanthropy; and for philanthropy, which means the whole class of English charity, she professes utter contempt. To minds of this order, evil might seem to have as necessary and recognised a place as good. There is the evil and there is the remedy; every abuse has its corrective, every vice is met and combated on its own ground. All honour to those who in Paris order their warfare after this fashion. It is the French way. They act according to precedent and temperament, and every well-intentioned effort may hope for its reward; but we cannot see that the present condition and aspect of Paris tells much for the value of the system as such, or argues for its exclusive adoption. However, it is certain that nothing so much persuades people that a real work is being done as to lay out a distinct method for the doing of it; and perhaps the following naïve reflection of our authoress may hit the real feelings of many who think they go deeper into things than it is in her nature to do.

‘It seems to me that if young girls go wrong in Paris, it must be by an inherent tendency to evil. I do not mean to say but that temptation abounds there, and that to an extent perhaps scarcely conceived by a casual observer; but so great is the activity and vigilance of the Church and her numerous *societies* with regard to the particular evil, that one is quite bewildered among the countless *œuvres* she has set in motion in behalf of young females.’—*Glance behind the Grilles*, p. 125.

As the lesson attempted to be taught in all these books is one and the same—the superiority of religious action in Paris in particular, and Roman Catholic countries generally, over London—and as two of them are mainly catalogues of examples to prove this point, we may as well state at once, that while admiring the zeal and pure aim of those who labour honestly in this vast and varied field, it yet appears to us that this blind trust in organization and *œuvres* as a national quality has the effect of relaxing individual effort. There always seems a more obvious course than doing that duty oneself that nature gave us to do. The most depraved, those who neglect the first principles of humanity, see that there is an elaborate system provided to rectify their errors, and nullify their bad effects. For example, an enormous machinery is on foot, a vast sum of existences are devoted (to the sacrifice of all natural ties), to train up children abandoned by their parents from the birth. But, not to dwell on this extreme case, which has been often discussed,



respectable family life is equally affected by this principle. The lovers of system, and those who set themselves to work out systems, are jealous of the seeming laxity of home influence, and lay themselves out to correct it by a mighty organization of schools. It would seem by the lists we read here, as if the *frères* and the *sœurs* of Paris would not leave a single child in its parents' hands, and they have their way, for the *ouvrier* class are willing to give up their children to them for an education which involves no expense, if it admits no interference. Even the holidays are short and rare, to preserve their scholars from contamination. Evidently proud of the extent and minuteness of their precautions, and the exact order of their regulations, the pervading control over mind and body they believe themselves to have accomplished, they have gladly exhibited to the English convert the organization which has effected such great things, and above all the ceaseless vigilance which keeps the complicated machinery in motion. It is a system which, carefully carried out, is sure to have a show of seeming fruit. Not a single misgiving seems ever to have visited either party, exhibitor or witness, that the acme of success had not been attained. How can mischief creep in when children are removed from the bad influence of home, and never permitted to receive a single evil impression? The thing is reduced in our author's mind to a syllogism. *Surveillance*, that French handmaid to organization, makes it impossible. 'C'est par une surveillance de tous les instans' that boys are kept under. Even the dormitories have no division or separation of any kind, because the *surveillance* can be more effectual. She thinks she sees its effects in a frankness and ingenuousness of character for which our schoolboys would be all the better. Girls are even protected from their parents by this pervading influence.

'The Supérieure was very communicative, and told me that this was an *œuvre* for the combined religious and secular education of young girls of the upper classes—a work which I do not think has ever been thought of amongst ourselves. Forty sisters devote themselves to the care of the pupils. Professors attend to instruct them in languages and accomplishments; but always give their lessons in the presence of one of the sisters. Indeed, they seem never to lose sight of their charges, as, when visited by their friends, or even parents, a sister is always seated behind the grille, in the parlour in which they receive them.'—*Ibid.* p. 11.

The sisters never willingly part with their pupils, even to take a walk with their parents, lest they should see what is going on in the world; they have no confidence in any one out of convent walls, nor in their own pupils, sufficient to trust that a curtain to a bed may not hide a dangerous secret from the constant vigilant eye.

'I am persuaded (cries our authoress in admiration) there is nothing to be had in England to compare with it at *any* price. How should there be? The principle on which they work is wholly different there (in Paris), it is a labour of self-sacrifice and a work of love; here it is a question of profit—a commercial speculation—a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence. There moral training and religious instruction, imparted with a watchful eye to the formation of character, form the basis of education, and it is clear that the social relations the pupils hold with these noble-minded and disinterested women, whose sole aim is to benefit them without any personal reward, *must* produce a very different moral result from the cold, suspicious, unconfiding intercourse which necessarily exists between a grasping schoolmistress, aided by hired underlings, and the young ladies, who are well aware they have a right to what they pay for.'—*Ibid.* p. 274.

The question of course is, Can any system secure absolute openness? Our authoress who sees no difficulties assumes that it can; that by dint of never taking an eye off a girl or boy, day or night, it is possible to insure inner rectitude: and therefore she sums up the subject by concluding, 'that those to whom 'it occurred to found and organize these institutions must have 'understood better than similar founders in England the peculiar characteristics of the young.' But in fact no mind can be really laid bare for any length of time and remain sane; every mind must have its secrets. 'The effect of this tremendous *surveillance*, we believe, must be to make this secret a conscious one. Under ordinary natural training the child is unconscious of its own reserves. A practice of concealment cannot fail to be maturing under this system of scrutiny, which may have much to do with the unchildish childhood and youth of French boys and girls which all observers of Parisian life dwell upon. We have touched on the subject here because it seems that this fundamental difference of training may have much to do with the national differences in the mode of effecting all great objects. Those trained to organization from their infancy organize in their turn; while the English, more independent, more subject to local accidental influences, and especially to the spirit of home, may seem to our neighbours to be working without system, and to such witnesses as our authoress not to be working at all. This prevalence of system, lay or cleric, is regarded differently according to the observer's estimate of the French character and institutions. Those whose sympathies go with the present aspect of affairs in Church and State consider it the secret of their greatness; others see in it an indication of that weakness which has produced and which exhibits such deplorable fruits.

'There is no people (says Mr. Bayle St. John) so systematic as the French—a characteristic I am sometimes disposed to attribute to their want of power of self-guidance. Nothing, according to them, is well done that is not done by rule. They talk freely of inspiration or vivid impulses, but take care never to trust them. We must all remember the time when,

in ardent pursuit of knowledge, we have portioned out our days and hours for particular studies; giving the morning to the classics, the afternoon to philosophy, Monday to history, Saturday to physics, and so on. Experience has taught us, that in this way we seem to go over a great deal of ground, and learn nothing after all. In most things, but especially their ideas of education, the French have not got beyond this period.'

By this showing, all the scrutiny, order, and vigilance detailed by our authoress seem to fall short of actual influence for good; if we are to believe, too, the *look* of things and concurrent testimony of a crowd of witnesses, native and foreign. The separation from home, perhaps still more the assumption of superior goodness both of person and calling in the teacher, the submission of parents to this external claim may well have weakened parental authority; though in France the relation of mother and child has always been distinguished by a peculiar tenderness of expression. 'He who was sent forth a pet child returns home a stranger,' says one who knows Paris life well. 'Friendships between brothers and sisters are rarely heard of, 'at any rate in Paris.' A French writer, M. Leguardier, has even written:—

'Family life no longer exists in France, unless we choose to give that name to an accidental aggregation of members, over which chance rather than affection presides. They collect together from habit; they shun one another from *ennui*, and they separate from interest when they can do without one another.'

We feel how likely something like this may be the case where a girl leaves her convent only to contract a marriage arranged for her by her parents; and who can suppose that under her new circumstances the remembrance of the *surveillance* under which her childhood has been passed can have such influence as a support and defence in temptation as the traditions and associations of home? Whether for good or evil, such a system of education, as all books on France reveal, establishes the one great difference between that country and our own, that of all the domestic relations—a vital difference, which must inevitably influence every public and private institution in either country.

On such questions as these, however, our authoress does not enter. She takes results for granted with the easiest credulity where the agency is to her mind; indeed, we might sometimes suppose that results were of minor importance to the means, so entranced is she with the meritorious self-sacrifice manifested in these undertakings—a fact which if made too apparent to the youthful scholar, must, we think, tell unfavourably on the affections as not being Nature's plan for their earliest cultivation. For it is a different position to be loved because it is charity to love us, because it is an *œuvre*, and perhaps a very difficult

one, perfumed in the spirit of self-sacrifice, and to bask in love which the child feels to belong to it by right, which comes to it through the ties of blood and the irresistible instincts of nature. And as this sublime and conspicuous self-denial is scarcely an indemnity for mothers' love, so we do not see that it need be more than an equivalent for that regard and tenderness which a good woman bestows on charges she has undertaken primarily for the just and virtuous end of earning her own living. Especially as it is even said that the sisters who direct girls' schools are particularly severe in their punishments, a charge which cannot be brought against any form of English education. But the language used habitually by this authoress towards honest industry too commonly accompanies an indiscriminating enthusiasm for what in technical language is called a more brilliant career.

It is time, however, to enter more particularly into the design of the works before us, and their author's fitness, moral and intellectual, for her task. As her first book professed to be a candid survey of the differences between the Church she was leaving and that she was adopting, the next, '*Flemish Interiors*,' written after her change is avowed, expresses her enthusiasm for all that is peculiar and distinctive in the Church of her adoption; while the last, '*Realities of Paris Life*' (though, as we write, we observe an announcement of another forthcoming work from the same pen), leaving Romanism in its purely ecclesiastical aspect, aims at showing us the picture of a city more or less under its influence—the world upon which it works. In the first flush of novelty which inspired her early pen, the English reader is roundly rebuked for caring to observe anything else when he goes abroad but the inner workings of the Church; in the last he is permitted some return to ordinary interests, but only under certain conditions, and with the authoress for his guide. The conceit which the possession of a new idea engenders, the sense of a monopoly, in truth, was never more distinctly developed than in them all. The first page falls foul of Murray's Handbook. Every man who consults that useful guide is a 'cockney,' who would think it as impossible to cross the Channel without his Handbook as to reach heaven without his Bible. 'But, reader, you will find no sympathy between us; my object 'being to introduce those who will accompany me into the hidden 'courts of those dwelling places of spiritual life of which the 'Handbook does not even mention the exterior,' and always the superiority of her motives and objects of interest are proclaimed with a self-sufficiency that only a mind, incapable of seeing the real bearing of things, and intoxicated by first impressions, could give voice to; though, of course, the temper of mind is natu-

ral and to be guarded against by every impressionable nature. Here the British traveller is loaded with sarcasm for looking only at the outside of things as he passes through Belgium, or for entering a church to 'stare' at a pulpit or to gaze at a picture; 'and all the while they are not even conscious that within that high silent wall, or behind that closed gateway, works of mercy, of penance, and of charity are sending their noiseless perfume up to heaven.' Whether the traveller is conscious or not of these facts, depends on individual opportunities; but it is no proof that he is indifferent to religion and virtue, that he does not seek to penetrate behind the screen—the time taken to do so ever so cursorily would defeat the object of his journey. What is inner and hidden can never meet the gaze of the passer-by; it would be just as reasonable to require every ecclesiologist who visits a church to make acquaintance with the rector and curate, as for those who enter a Belgian church to seek an interview with the priest. Besides, we may ask this lady and those she represents, what do people really learn by a hasty passing glance, if they have not further opportunities for weighing the justice of first impressions? We cannot but think that a longer acquaintance would have modified some of her own; and we therefore receive with caution the flowing details of austerities which she accepted without a question; for example, we should like to know what definite meaning is to be attached to the statement that a whole community of women can accomplish an entire day of unbroken contemplation:—

'The same pious custom is pursued by all the sisters who in their fêtes, or days for which their founders had a particular devotion, as well as on Fridays, pass the entire day in religious contemplation. They assert that these are their happiest seasons, and that they never seem to last long enough; insomuch that although the rule only appoints the duration of their meditation till six o'clock, they are only too glad to be allowed to continue it till bed-time.'—*Flemish Interiors*, p. 26.

And of the same sisters such facts as the following, though we assume a foundation of truth, yet in their effects on body and mind we must still hear further before the information can be edifying or more than curious. We are very certain that we are not told all that it is necessary to know for a right apprehension.

'There would seem to be no austerity these sisters do not practise; although barefoot, their floors are of brick, and they allow themselves no fire, even in the severest weather. They never lie down, but sleep upright. I went up a narrow corkscrew stone staircase into their cells, and saw their extraordinary beds; they consist of a hard and almost cylindrical mattress, stuffed with straw, about three feet long, at right angles to which is fixed an equally hard upright palliase, to support the back. There is no pillow, neither are there sheets, and only one small thin blanket.'—*Ibid.* p. 27.

In like manner we own to a questioning spirit as to the real

posture of mind of the English girl of nineteen, niece to an English archbishop, who had joined this order, with whom the writer had an interview. The attachment of the mind to its domicile is, we know, not in proportion to the pleasure found there, but to its estrangement from every other locality. But the attachment of habit had not yet influence over this young girl; we therefore read of her deportment with curiosity and some sadness in spite of her visitor's glowing conviction. The novice showed her face for an instant through the grille, and then hid it behind the shutter.

'She spoke in a timid, hurried manner, which may possibly have been natural to her; but nothing could be more expressive of cheerfulness, not to say hilarity, than the tone of her voice. Indeed, I was told afterwards that she and another young novice, a Dutch lady, skipped about "like two kittens" for joy at the thought that they were so soon to make their profession. . . . She said she had never been so happy in her life; the delight she experienced at the thought of her approaching reception was so great, that she sometimes felt as if it were too much happiness for this world. She affirmed she had never felt the slightest mischief or inconvenience from walking barefoot, and that she had never enjoyed such good health as since she commenced her noviciate. She asked my friend after his wife and children, and seemed pleased when we gave her some information of her brothers, who, like her, were recent converts.—*Ibid.* p. 30.'

Who recognises the English girl in this profuse expression of feeling, this kittenish transport, this lukewarm interest in family news? What strange processes had her mind been subjected to, to have already lost all nationality? A passing interview is not enough to account for the phenomenon. Still, while we attribute credulity to our authoress, a willingness to believe on insufficient evidence both good and bad that suits her purpose, we accept her statements as the results of her own observation; but she is mistaken, and those whose opinion in this matter she represents, that the insight she would give us into monastic life in all its force and strictness, can have any persuasive effect on the English reader unless the system is shown to work some evident strengthening and invigorating change on the mind and character beyond what habitual self-control and moderate abstinence are known to accomplish. She sneers at Protestant Bible readers; and we must say that reading the Bible does not prepare us for such pictures of Christianity as she brings before us, either in the asceticism which she terms a triumph over human nature or in its effect on the intellect. She expects us to be charmed with a certain imbecility which she takes for Christian simplicity and guilelessness. We are not *blaming* it in the examples she brings before us,—it is probably an inevitable consequence of the mode of life; but we cannot forget that S. Paul has said, 'In understanding be ye men.' And are we mistaken in calling puerile such scenes as the



following? Father Ignatius, an English Trappist, pays a visit with a Père Carmelite and our authoress to a Carmelite nunnery; and the point, in recording what passed, is to show the infantine vivacity of spirits under extreme bodily privation. The Mère Sous-Prieure receives them behind a curtain which is never removed. Some pleasantry occurs at the outset between the monk and the nun on their comparative means of forming a personal acquaintance. The latter then receives in solemn silence some information from the Père, but

'When he introduced Father Ignatius as a Trappist monk, she made no attempt to disguise the delight with which she heard the information. The effect was talismanic. They immediately entered into a brisk and animated colloquy, and soon found a point of common interest in the reciprocal devotion of their respective orders of S. Theresa and S. Bernard. After some conversation on the subject, it was mutually agreed that they should endeavour to prevail on their superiors to interchange the intentions of their respective masses on the two days dedicated to these saints, an idea which appeared to afford infinite satisfaction to both.'—*Ibid.* p. 80.

We are not disposed to class under the same head the zest for manual occupation, of which she gives instances as a proof of humility and devotion; yet we see in it neither the one nor the other, so much as the wholesome love of work denied a larger sphere. Here is a picture with which even the ordinary traveller is familiar, on which he has drawn his own comments. It is a Frère Redemptoriste preparing for the *fête* of S. Alphonse Liguori, a name familiar to these pages, for whom this author professes a peculiar devotion, as offering us the example of a life 'almost dazzling us with its brilliancy' in contrast with the surrounding gloom of modern times.

'One of the brothers was decorating it (the altar) with unusual care. He had a vast number of flower-pots containing roses and other plants in full bloom, and seemed very fastidious about placing them. He fixed and un-fixed, arranged and rearranged them again and again, getting down from the steps on which he was mounted, and viewing his performance from a little distance each time to judge of the effect. This was no slight labour, especially as every time he passed the tabernacle he dropped on one knee in front of it. This being done, he brought out some large and handsome candlesticks, containing tall *cierges*, and spent much time and thought on their disposal likewise.

In another place she exclaims, 'They seem to glory in performing the most humiliating offices. In one room through which we passed, one was papering the walls, and another, with a large brush, whitewashing the ceiling' (in some country parsonages at home, we do not doubt the same marvellous acts of humiliation and self-denial may be witnessed); 'all looked cheerful and good-humoured over their work.' We have no doubt these good brothers would

be not a little amused at the grandeur attributed to their contentment. But this is one instance of the undiscerning quality of our authoress's judgment. Most people *like* manual occupation, and to be employed in real productive labour, if they can do it without loss of caste. Monks and nuns are certain, in most cases, to enjoy it, from their peculiar circumstances. Not that they have necessarily lost all sense of this world's rank, but that no station is compromised. Yet she thinks it noteworthy, and a trait of the superiority of one Church over the other, that an abbé should not be ashamed to introduce to her his aunt, a sister of S. Vincent de Paul, while that good lady was peeling carrots. Had he greeted a labourer's wife in a bye-lane so occupied as a near relation, it might have proved something; but the action in a nunnery only showed the habits of the order, of which he might even be proud on the occasion of showing it to a foreigner. It is only an example of a very common habit with minds upset by the fever of change, and whose interest it is to see things in an aspect to justify that change.

These works, however, are written not only under the disability of estimating things at their right value, which all novices labour under, but with the further disadvantage of a false assumption. Everything is asserted to have been viewed under different circumstances from the real ones, which is enough of itself to give an erroneous impression. We would not be over-critical, and authors have a right to preserve their incognito; but when a lady professes to suffer under all the anxieties of the ministerial life, to be full of the doubts that position has engendered, when it is a question how many celebrations of the Holy Communion she will arrange on her return, when she professes to know 'other parish priests similarly situated with myself,' and remembers 'asking the same question of a brother clergyman in England,' the bounds of truth and honesty are transgressed, and we detect in these gratuitous attempts at deception, as in other places, a sympathy with the science of casuistry, and an amusement in going as near the wind as conscience can possibly allow, which tells ill for her value as a stater of facts. The thing had apparently a new interest to her. We have a specimen of trying a hand at a pious fraud in 'the Grilles,' evidently an experiment of a new sensation. It is where, making acquaintance with an English boy, of Protestant parents, and finding him ill, she sends a sister, also a convert, to nurse him, adding a request that she would not interfere with his faith. 'By no means,' says sister Mary, 'our charity is not confined to the body.' 'In which case,' answers our authoress, 'I must beg you not to

'go. It would never do for me to interfere with the intentions of those who have control over him.' 'But,' says the sister, 'you can't prevent my going.' 'Of course (said I, secretly admiring her zeal) you can do as you please; I have no power to stop you; but you must remember, my request was only made conditionally.' This is very clumsy work, certainly; but our authoress, under a show of readiness and sharpness, has a clumsy mind, quite at fault how to establish a real relation with her reader, and unable to calculate on the effect on others of the processes of her own reason. It is the courage of insensibility which we have observed to be the courage of talkative disputers in religion, and is founded on the misplaced confidence of egotism, such as leads this lady to expect her readers to be shocked that a pew-opener at Bath cannot answer whether there is a 'celebration' that morning, so soon as she has adopted the new word into her vocabulary: and to wonder with her what the benighted Welsh landlady would have said to the 'eighty masses a day in the Cathedral of Cordova,' when the good woman had been led to the general admission that 'we cannot have too much of a good thing.'

The style of these volumes reflects, or rather is formed by, the various characteristics of thought and position which have dictated them. It is a patchwork of French-English, borrowed from French statistics and French authors, and common, not to say vulgar, colloquial English, seasoned at times with a certain slang phraseology designed to represent manly roughness, but never getting beyond feminine *fastness*. The spirited 'Bravo, Lord John, say we!' the allusion to 'Bacchus, the rosy god,' the reference to 'our waistcoat-pocket,' the 'coarse hide' of the poor fish-wife, even the wealth of classical allusion, the constant reference to Horace and Ovid, Euripides and Sophocles, can't take us in. The woman stands confessed through all, not writing in her own person, but as she thinks men write when in a reckless vein; indulging at one time in a string of bad puns, at another in irreverent scriptural allusion, for our authoress has imbibed a thoroughly Popish sentiment towards the English Version. Altogether, the style fitly expresses one of those minds which, looking only on the surface, sees no difficulties, and finds it perfectly easy to reconcile everything to its own standard.

In this temper and with these capabilities the authoress has undertaken to show us the hidden life of Paris, the realities where ordinary observers only see the surface. She has gone about. She has taken notes. She has made a catalogue of *œuvres*. She has consulted documents. She has laboriously visited the 'rookeries' and the 'cité's ouvrières.' She devotes a

chapter to the 'Chiffonniers' and the *quartier* where they exist. She carries us to the asylums, and gives details of their working. She describes the gamin, the charlatan, the thieves, the soldiers, the prisons, and the police, all with elaborate detail and indiscriminating minuteness, but never once shows a real grasp of her subject—or a judgment to be depended on; never makes any statement which on her independent authority can be trusted. The real under-current of Parisian life is hidden from her. She knows nothing, or at least tells nothing, of the hopes, the motives, the secret machinery which guide and influence the masses. She relates nothing but what she has been told. She has seen nothing but what she has been shown. She has formed no opinion but by permission of her prejudices. She never swerves from the prime motive of her labours—to prove everything better in Paris than London. The institutions of Paris are better managed than ours, its government more effectual, its police more ubiquitous, its thieves more full of resource, its soldiers better men, its youth more docile, its life more religious, its dead better cared for. And everything is proved with the greatest ease in the world. A mode of argument is adopted common enough with us all, but never pushed to so naïve an extreme as in this instance. Her plan is to prove her assertions (and our authoress never asserts anything without proof) by the statements of the friends of the institutions she likes, and by the enemies of those she hates; by the representations of the conductors and directors of French systems, and the avowed accusers and detractors of English ones. If anybody for any purpose has ever said the word she wants to be said, it does without further inquiry. Thus, for instance, she says that there is no case known of starvation in Paris, whereas it is notorious that 3,292 persons have died from want of the necessities of life within ten years in London. Indeed she would insinuate this wholesale mortality to be constantly raging round us, for, addressing her English readers and reminding them of their comforts, she makes this appeal,—

'Which of us, thus pillowed, ever pictured to himself the fact that at that very moment hundreds, nay thousands (for it is the *majority* of our fellow-beings), in the same town—maybe, some in the same street—are denuded of the barest necessities, and penetrated with cold to the very bones?—that if housed at all, they are shivering and quaking under the influence of fatigue, want, and hunger, in a bare and naked room?'—*Realities of Paris Life*, Preface viii.

She describes the Paris *gamins* by anecdotes and national boasts of their cleverness, our London boys by the police reports. She contrasts our rogues with their honest men, the speeches of our counsel defending a prisoner with the judgment

of a French judge laying down the law. Both are alike assumed to be deliberate expressions of opinion and tests of national morals. Looking over an *œuvre* in Belgium for the deaf and dumb, and full of admiration for the *Sœurs'* success, she quotes without hesitation the assertion of somebody that in our Kent-road Asylum (which by the way we know to be most carefully and successfully conducted, and with constant attention to religious instruction)—

'The result of their system shows them to be unaccountably savage and vicious, mischievous and deceitful, quarrelsome and unkind to one another, and oblivious and ungrateful towards their masters and superiors.'—*Flemish Interiors*, p. 116.

A single statement from any quarter exonerates her from all responsibility. Thus it is obvious that our clergy do not visit the sick, because Archbishop Whately (so she says, and, as we believe, untruly says) has said something which bears another construction.

'While the duty and the happiness of the Catholic priest consists in comforting and administering to the sick and dying, to whom this world can no longer offer consolation, the Protestant minister is actually forbidden by ecclesiastical authority (*vide* Charge of Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin) to approach such of his parishioners as are attacked by infectious diseases, alleging that the sick-bed—and therefore worst of all the death-bed—is no place for such ministry. "Their business is to preach the Gospel." Of course, his Grace ought to know; far be it from us to call in question so exalted an authority.'—*Realities of Paris Life*, vol. ii. p. 260.

For once, on occasion of a splenetic allusion to Miss Nightingale, authorities fail her altogether, and she talks without them. It is where she speaks of the *ovation* that welcomed that lady's return; whereas the point of the story is the simple modest dignity by which Miss Nightingale contrived to have no ovation at all, and to steal back to her country and to private life without anybody knowing.

'No "special correspondent" noted their [the Sisters' of S. Vincent de Paul] individual—no, nor yet their collective—exertions; no newspaper praise seconded their deeds or lauded their endurance; no ovation welcomed their return; no subscriptions were raised on their behalf; no hospitals will be erected in their honour, or named after their names; and no sovereigns invited them to their palaces or decorated them with ornaments of gold and precious stones. Oh no! *they* are too ambitious to be satisfied with such rewards as these; a perishable monument of stone will not suffice to satisfy their upward longings.'—*Ibid.* p. 267.

This strain does not prevent her relating with approbation, in another place, how the celebrated Sœur Rosalie was invested with the Cross of the Legion of Honour by the Emperor and Empress, who paid a visit to her own *quartier* to enhance the distinction. But we are always in the wrong

with those whose line of action has made it necessary to a restless conscience to prove us so. Even while this writer apologises for the Parisian desecration of Sunday, she is careful to prove that our observance does us no good; indeed, comparing our purlieus and low haunts with their places of highest resort, she proves there is little difference on this point between the two cities, and condenses our Sunday observances, in the words of the *Times* (whose columns she largely quotes from), to 'listening to noisy charity children on part of the seventh day after buying and selling during the remaining six.' All our newspaper catalogues of crimes and offences are brought up against us. The authoress acknowledges to piles of such documents lying before her, as she writes—

'Our readers would, we are sure, be as much astonished as ourselves at the large collection we have before us of misdemeanours for which these gentlemen (in this case it is the British soldier who is under review) are responsible. They comprise "brutal outrages," "daring attempts at desertion," "fatal military affrays," "sergeants robbing recruits," "burglaries," "robberies," "swindlings," and "midnight freaks at the barracks," &c., &c.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 222.

When England is described by its police reports and France is portrayed in a series of friendly inspections made for the occasion, we are not likely to come at much real appreciation of either country. The idea of such an estimate could only have occurred to a mind divested of the ordinary powers of perception; but it cannot fail to tell on the side she favours, for the French carefully observe the advice of their national proverb and wash their *linge sale en famille*, while we perform all those processes in ostentatious publicity. As we see no trace in these pages of an independent exercise of judgment, it betrays the feeling of the Church party in Paris, which manages these things, and with which the authoress is associated, that there are constant sneers and insinuations against a free press. It seems to us a short-sighted policy to identify religious, or rather Church, progress with the career of the present Emperor; but we see that he is defended in every act and principle by the working, active clergy, whom she has been among. One would think that M. de Montalembert by his long and energetic services had earned himself some claim on the affections and sympathy of the Church in France, but at the time of his trial this lady is anxious to prove that nobody in Paris cared about him, his cause, or his persecution.

'In Paris public opinion, no less than public conduct, is subject to the control of the police; and, accustomed as we are to a press which is *allowed* a great deal of liberty and takes a great deal more. . . . To cite a case in point, it could not but have struck the English minds of all British visitors in Paris as a startling "reality" that the French papers should, one



and all, appear on the morning following M. de Montalembert's trial, without one word of comment on a subject, which, from various causes, had excited so general an interest, and yet the result, it must be admitted, proves the wisdom of the measure; the subject, which would of course have been canvassed and discussed by the readers of the different journals, according to the view taken by the one each happened respectively to patronise, dropped at once into oblivion, and though the question of M. de Montalembert's condemnation was remaining actually pending, awaiting the appeal, so entirely had it ceased to occupy the public mind, that it may be said to have died a natural death almost immediately after its birth.

'While the English journalists—delighted with a new subject to fill their leaders during the dull season—were wearing out their pens and exhausting their brains in desperate efforts to say something bright and striking in the "mare's nest" they had found; not only were the papers in Paris occupied with anything and everything else, but even private opinion was silent on the subject. The masses had not even heard of it; the upper classes—unless of the party—were perfectly indifferent to it; and the clergy had no opinion on the matter, one way or the other. One priest, to whom we happened to speak of the affair, answered with a shrug, "Ma foi! nous n'y pensons même pas."—*Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 31.

Many of her details show amongst the hard-workers, the practical people who carry out the *bons œuvres* she describes, an excessive fear of general enlightenment and diffusion of ideas, a desire to keep things quiet, to preserve a calm surface, which accounts for their sympathy with the present Government, which is, in fact, a sympathy with the principle of suppression and keeping under. It is a time when the clergy are allowed a greater liberty, so to say, and it is only natural that where people are free themselves, they should not be very keenly alive to other people's bondage. 'With the "religious liberty," she writes, "which has been restored to France, we find the Church once more beginning to act "with vigour." Societies and associations are formed; vicious "and profligate neighbourhoods are examined into." Under this apparent prosperity the clergy are evidently willing to play into the Emperor's hands, and to assist him in the especial means by which his power is to be preserved. In their *œuvres* for the soldiers, which provide for their amusement as well as instruction, no newspaper is ever allowed in the *salle de jeux*, neither is a word on politics ever dropped, directly or indirectly, in their presence. In the *œuvres* for chimney-sweeps, they are not taught to read, and we cannot but suspect that the author's comment on this omission is derived from those who carry out the good work.

'None of them can even read; perhaps there is no great harm in this. It is a bold thing to say in these days of "progress," but we honestly think it might not be amiss if this deficiency were more general. Unhappily, among the lower orders, knowledge is oftener abused than used.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 132.

Church and Government alike dread a sense of independence; and the means which Power uses are found very efficient and available helps for the System which undertakes to think for all its members. In reward for such services we have anecdotes recorded, full of French unction, and very much in the pattern of the old tales of the first Napoleon, representing the Emperor in the most generous and amiable light, rewarding merit, succouring distress, redressing wrongs, and acting in all these functions under the joint inspiration of the Carmelite convent, and 'Notre Dame des Victoires.' First, we have the suppliant vaguely promised the patronage of some great personage, and exclaiming, 'If this personage be a man, I will entreat him as I should entreat God; if a woman, I will invoke her as I would invoke the Blessed Virgin.' Next, there is the scene in the camp; the Emperor summons the expectant private—

"Bernardet!" "Présent, mon Empereur," replied the soldier, throwing himself into the prescribed attitude. "Advance, my friend. You wrote to me about three weeks ago?" "Yes, Sire." "To commend your father to my notice?" "Yes, Sire." "A brave old soldier, who nobly served his country six-and-twenty years?" "Yes, Sire." "Very well, I will do something for him; in the meantime, hand him this little remembrance from me." Saying this, he slipped ten Napoleons into Bernardet's hand, as he stood motionless, and, as it were, magnetised by emotion and joy.—Vol. ii. p. 251.

Under this particular state of feeling, the French army is an especial object of interest to our authoress, who shows a true blind feminine tenderness for the military profession in every branch. 'In Catholic countries,' she observes, 'and certainly in France, we are struck by that analogy so universally observed in all ages between the military and spiritual combatant. Both are looked upon as the friends of humanity indiscriminately.' And she goes on to prove how superior the French soldier is to the British one. First, though many of her own indirect statements go against the view, she assumes that on the question of religious feeling there can be no comparison instituted between the French and English soldier, and proves this by the widest assertions; as that the conscripts of Brittany—'that land of faith and of fidelity—are generally proof against evil counsel and bad example:—' or by a few exceptional anecdotes, as of the deathbeds and last sayings of soldiers and officers in the Crimea, or by the fact of a Zouave turning Trappist. Indeed these dear Zouaves, 'brave, dauntless fellows,' are her prime favourites, whether Trappist or not; in every respect they are delightful. She can forgive the *gamins* the follies of youth, when she reflects that they often turn Zouaves in the end. In regard to such excellent results she excuses the practice of conscription,

and prefers it to our system of enlistment, as insuring necessarily a superior class. Their compulsory service of seven years seems with her only to lead to a glorious career, and the possibility of the highest distinctions. Mr. Bayle St. John's observation of the system speaks a different language, certainly more in harmony with experience and probability.

'A fact that must be borne in mind, if we would understand what takes place in France, is, that in every twenty years at least a million and a half of men are restored from the army to the plough or other occupations, for the most part tainted with laziness and licentiousness. I quote the following account from a French writer, rather an optimist than otherwise, who published under the reign of Louis Philippe:—

"Look," says M. Alletz, "at the soldier just freed from service; he spends before his departure, in some coarse pleasures, the money which he has received from home to enable him to return. Reduced to pawn a portion of his garments to supply the deficiency thus created, he reaches his native place half naked, drooping with fatigue and hunger. In a few days is exhausted the natural joy he feels at finding himself among his friends again. Accustomed to the excitement of danger, if he have been in the field, or to the vagabond indolence which he leads in great cities during a long peace, he soon feels a heavy and a brutal ennui. Everything is strange and monotonous to him; the tranquillity of the country contrasts with his old habits; the uniformity of the life which he is compelled to lead, wearies him; used as he is to perpetual change, the solitude of the village gives no scope to his loquacity; the necessity of work alarms his indolence; even his newly-acquired liberty embarrasses a character broken in by discipline; he misses the public places of the cities; ennui makes him irritable and hard; he seeks out companions in arms and idleness; gets drunk with them; quarrels, grieves or drives his family to despair; shortens the days of his mother; becomes an evil example to youth, excites the indignation of all respectable people, is a cause of affliction and dishonour to his family, and disturbs the repose of the magistrate. It is a sad thing to say, but it is too frequent to find soldiers among the greatest criminals."—*Purple Tints*, vol. ii. p. 225.

Our authoress, however, hears of the soldier while still under discipline, and in the state to be worked upon—*penetrated*, to use her French phrase—with principles of religion. And viewing him through the organization for his instruction sanctioned by the Emperor, through the labours of the *œuvres militaires*, and of course of their successes, the vast mass which is not influenced at all, which succumbs under the enormous temptations of a soldier's life, passes from her recollection, and she comes to the conclusion that on the whole the French army is the most religious class in France. But every class with her, brought absolutely and by whatever means under the influence of an *œuvre*, and seen through that medium, assumes an interest of which we could not complain if it did not lead to injurious comparisons. She is great on prisons and reformatories, in which those that live are reformed with suspicious ease;—those that die, die 'in the best dispositions.' When

our jail chaplains modestly hope there is evidence 'that the Gospel is the power of God even in a prison,' she would like to *see* that evidence; but when the chaplain of a French military prison points out to her one of his charges as 'un vrai petit saint,' 'C'est un charmant enfant que je confessais hier, et qui est d'une piété angélique,' she accepts the praise implicitly as evidence of a great work, and a token of the power of faith in the speaker. As characteristic of the authoress's own style—distinguished from the compound of French idiom, dry statistics, and newspaper phraseology which makes up much of this work; as a trait too of that low social morality that does not scruple to report private conversation, which we sometimes see to accompany an habitually unfair line of thought and feeling—we extract some part of a scene she represents to have passed at a dinner-table at which she was present. We do not know whether it had best be true or not for the writer's credit. Why the *white* waistcoat should be an unmistakable sign of an English clergyman we do not know, nor yet how a jail chaplain should be so bright a cynosure to young ladies. To have clean teeth and hands we can quite believe is a disqualification after a familiar experience of French Capucins. It throws a suspicion over the whole story; and we may perhaps exculpate the lady of any real breach of the laws of hospitality by assuming the whole *mise en scène* to be a mere fancy sketch.

'Let not our readers charge us with prejudice, or want of charity, till they have perused the following episode, which we make no apology for introducing here, though we hope and believe the case is, in most respects, exceptional.

'It is not very long since—seated at the table of a friend, round which were assembled twelve or fourteen guests—we found ourselves placed opposite a gentleman whose dress and general appearance betokened the fact that he was in "holy orders." His coat was of the blackest, while his waistcoat and neckcloth were of dazzling brilliancy, in fact, they rivalled the whiteness of his teeth, and we had almost added, of his hands—in themselves an advertisement for Morris's almond paste, with which doubtless they had been softened and scented.

'His manner of speaking was slow, deliberate, dignified, of the Shaftesbury school; his age might be five-and-forty, and he was decidedly too old for the young lady who sat next to him, but who looked upon him with an interest inspired, in all probability, by his "holy calling." During dinner it was elicited that our friend was not only a "reverend," but a prison chaplain; and the conversation having turned upon the subject of a remarkable case, the principal actor in which had been recently executed, the "man in black," as Oliver Goldsmith has it, remarked, in a somewhat supercilious tone, and delicately passing his white hands one over the other: "I had him under my care after his condemnation." "Indeed!" interrupted a naval officer at our left; "and, pray, how did he behave after he came under your notice? It must be a strange position for a man to feel himself in." "Ah!—well—a—he was very indifferent—to every-

thing that ought to have interested him," replied the prison chaplain, evasively shaking his head almost as suggestively, and much more ominously, than Lord Burleigh. "Well, I'm always interested in these cases, somehow," said the other, in his blunt, honest manner; "what *did* he do?" "He—a—well, he wasn't—he wasn't at all—impressed with his position," said the first; and finding himself pushed, he proceeded in the same slow and hesitating tone, &c. &c.

'Mr. P——,' the criminal, received the chaplain's first advances coldly, whether in the form of personal attendance or the offered loan of a book.

"And then?" inquired the officer, who was listening attentively to the recital. "Why," stammered the reverend gentleman, who did not quite relish this unexpected cross-examination, and began to feel rather taken aback; "Why—I—a—I don't know; I never saw him again; I felt it was a hopeless case, and so—and so—I left him."

The lady of the house, feeling for the confusion of her guest, adroitly turns the conversation to watering-places, card-parties, county balls, equestrian pic-nics, shooting excursions, in all of which we are to assume our jail chaplain played an important and leading part, the means for such expensive aristocratic pleasures being abundantly supplied to him by the stipend of his office. The writer keeps a sharp look-out on salaries, and grudges the labourer his hire, with an asperity of economy when that labourer is a 'Protestant.'

In juxtaposition, and therefore in contrast, with this incident is related a striking story of an execution not long ago at Ghent. The mode of vouching for the authenticity of her facts is characteristic, 'it must be true, because she has seen and conversed with the actor in it,' the *aumônier de prison*, whose zeal, according to this narrative, was worthy a better success, though we think a finer tact and discernment would have suggested some remission of importunities.

'He wore a dark brown habit, of coarse thick cloth, confined round his waist with a cord, and his hood was thrown back upon his shoulders. His feet were bare, and his whole aspect betokened the man of self-denying asceticism.

'Unhappily the prisoner was a hardened villain; deaf to the words, to the prayers, to the persuasions of the father, he stopped his ears, he turned away his head, he refused to be instructed, to be reclaimed, to be comforted; he blasphemed and he cursed. The "Recollet" was obliged after a time to retire, but it was only to return to the charge. Every hour he would come to see if there was no change in the unhappy man, and each visit was to prove a fresh disappointment. . . . The whole day and night (previous to the execution) was passed in the condemned cell, either in earnest entreaties to the prisoner to listen to him, or in earnest prayer to God to turn his heart, but alas! all in vain. The "Recollet" declared his determination not to leave him, and when the officials appeared to make the last preparations he was still by his side. The gloomy procession wended its way to the place of punishment, the "Recollet" father still

walking by the culprit's side, and receiving from him nothing but imprecations and blasphemies. At last the scaffold is reached and the prisoner is handed over to the executioner; his hands are bound, his eyes are covered, a few minutes more and all will be over; his strength is failing him, but see, he makes a convulsive sign to the poor "Recollet" to approach. "Thank God!" ejaculates the holy man; "He has heard my prayers, and my perseverance has been rewarded." He approaches eagerly. "Oh but for an act of contrition, *even now!* through the merits of our dear Lord he will not perish." He approaches his ear to the mouth of the murderer, eager to catch the long-desired accents—but what is his horror, when the wretch, uttering a loud curse, spits in his face! At this fearful termination of all his hopes, nature yielded, the poor priest fainted, and was borne to his monastery, where a brain fever of some weeks' duration became his reward for the devoted spirit in which he had offered his labours of love."—Vol. iii. 216.

We would not dispute the point that the organization of the sister Church has its striking effects, and at any rate seeming points of advantage. All the great events of life and society, for joy or sorrow, are illuminated there by an appropriate light and colouring. Religion as seen in observances, as interposing in exciting or poignant moments, has a body, a visible existence, which impresses the universal heart. We doubt on our part if the most virulent Protestants that ever lived can fairly get away from its influence. Let them only see it, not here, where it looks out of place and unnatural, but in its acknowledged home, and some feature of the vast system will strike a chord, and awaken a sense of sympathy and of brotherhood. But this admission, after all, tells for very little. The sentiment 'as we mean it' is only a sentiment, and is compatible with strange lengths of positive unbelief. No one can read modern French literature without being aware that the French of this day are more 'Catholic' than Christian; that a sentimental regard for ceremonies, and even habits of thought, survives definite, distinct belief. A Frenchman is in a sort of way proud of his Church, whether he believes in it or not, whether he respects its clergy or not. It is a point of honour with him to assume that it is the best exponent of Christianity that exists. Of course a Frenchman's Christianity must be the best; the national gift of acumen and intelligence will preserve him from every avoidable error. Even such writers as George Sand assume that their country's Romanism is synonymous with Christianity, and she betrays now and then a regard for its peculiar privileges entirely at variance with the unbelieving tone of what is called her philosophy, and irrespective of the principle from which the privileges gain their worth. How to reconcile doubt on the very question of a future state with jealous clinging to the last sacraments, we do not know. We only see that it is natural,



and that persons who boast that our life ends with our last breath, and who live accordingly, hold the priests to their last offices with superstitious punctiliousness. The most notorious unbelievers make a decorous ending, and their fellow unbelievers are glad that they do. From assuming that it is either Romanism in every article, or atheism, some of them come to think it the Church and atheism. Mr. Bayle St. John quotes an abbé, who relates how he once met a man in the fields who hastened to inform him, as if it were an interesting fact, that he believed 'neither in heaven nor in hell.' On being mildly expostulated with, he grew warm, and began to attack the clergy, saying among other fine things, 'Those gentlemen in black tried to persuade us that Voltaire would not be admitted into Paradise. But when he presented himself at the gates, S. Peter opened them back on their hinges, and ushered him in with a bow.' His own large experience of Frenchmen who profess materialism, and live after its principles, leads this author to the conviction that this anecdote illustrates the mental state of most who affect this unhallowed creed. In another place, he relates the system by which a 'poor bachelor' contrives with 20*l.* a year to lead a life of pleasure. It is a picture evidently drawn from the life, and concludes:—

'Mr. F—— looks upon the whole world as a medium in which his enjoyments are to take place; whether he has any suspicion of anything beyond, I know not. If we may believe what he says, he "jumps the life to come," and sees no difference between his own destiny and that of a dog. However, he has some superstitions:—attributed an accident on board a steamer from S. Cloud to the presence of a priest; trembles if salt be upset on the table-cloth; will not give or receive a knife as a present, and is indignant with the clergy who refuse the offices of the Church to the impenitent dead.'—*Purple Tints*, vol. ii. 249.

This disposition is likely to have a very telling effect on minds represented by our authoress. Observing a show of respect, hearing of no dissent, these things assume a unity which in reality means nothing. When the present writer sat down to a *table d'hôte* in France, and saw the Frenchmen present all eating meat on Friday, she presumes they were all provided with dispensations, so resolutely did she cherish the notion of an unbroken communion of saints; and every, the slightest, outward conformity is accepted in the same undoubting spirit. To such thinkers our English Church would gain in unity if all 'our dissenting brethren' were to shut up their meeting-houses and turn sceptics. When they dissent in Paris, they do it with a vengeance. But it is a way to make them indifferent to questions of form and order; they have no temptation to set up a visible counter ideal.

Since the *coup d'Etat* there is no doubt that the aspect of things in Paris shows more of the Church's work, that it has really become a more conspicuous element. All parties are agreed to the fact of its vastly increased influence on education; the Jesuits have now an immense number of establishments under them, in which they jealously infuse their own views on history and science, as well as religion. All these undertakings, *œuvres* and other institutions, are a feature that should count more among the great conspicuous facts of Paris than they have done of late years. But what this writer aims to prove from the pile of details indiscriminately heaped together, is that the mass of Parisians are more under religious influence than the same mass in London. Now the greater part of the works she details are missions—missions engaged upon the poor and destitute or disgraced classes. The compact rank of middle life is never touched upon by her, the class with us most under religious and moral influences, and which gives the tone to the English character. Authorities who speak from experience attribute to this class in Paris a tone in both religion and morals below the fellow class in England. This is not a question of prisons or police, which only interfere with the lower order of offenders against morals; it cannot be settled by statistics. It is a matter of experience and close discerning observation. The work before us does not touch on the moral state of the French middle classes, and therefore can give us no real idea of the present state of Paris. The plan is to answer the charges which have been brought against the bulk of Parisian society by counter-charges against a lower class in London, which, of course, renders the attempt at comparison futile. She will, for instance, boast the superior order observed in public places of amusement for the lowest classes, in Paris contrasted with London. Personally, we do not suppose her in a position to judge; but we find her repeating what others have said—

‘Whether from fear of God, or simply from fear of the police, we do not pretend to say, but the amusements of the lower classes, such as penny theatres, penny dancing-saloons, music-halls, &c. are tame, prudish places of resort, and not comparable for “fun” (and impropriety) with those gaffs and casinos nightly *ignored* in Whitechapel, Finsbury, and Holborn, ay, and much nearer the West End than that. . . . We know, from personal investigation, that the *salons de danse*, à 10c. *pour le cavalier et sa dame*, even *hors barrière*, are perfectly harmless; and whether as regards propriety of dress or conduct, far less open to censure than many a fashionable ball-room in the squares of London.’—*Realities of Paris Life*, Preface, p. v.

Has this lady visited the Jardin Mabille? If she has, and dares to say that such a place stands in favourable comparison to anything in England, we have nothing to say for her or to

her. If she has not visited it, she has no right to speak on the subject. But we may say more. No mention is made of those more brilliant scenes of Parisian dissipation constantly open, but which culminate to a point of frenzy at carnival time in the masked ball at the opera: too expensive for the poor on their own account, and of which we read, 'I saw 'at the opera, and have seen at other places, men whom 'the world could scarcely conceive present at such scenes, not 'merely spectators, but joining in all the mad enjoyment of 'the occasion,—laughing, talking worse than nonsense, flirting, 'and even dancing—or rather gesticulating—like mad men 'and fools as they all were for the moment,' and there were women of the same rank looking on. We are not going to enter into the details needed to prove the point of a low moral standard in the *bourgeoisie* of Paris. We only say it is commonly said, and not contradicted here. Let anybody compare the moral cast of the middle classes as displayed in the parallel satires and caricatures of the Paris *Charivari* and the London *Punch*, and he will get a fair estimate of the relative character of French and English life. These 'Realities of Paris' give us but a one-sided idea of life there, and send us elsewhere for impressions to be relied on. Even in the picture of the lower classes it is the same; their morals, their habits of thought, their domestic arrangements, are scarcely hinted at except to magnify the *œuvres* at work to counteract them. Every social abuse and sin among ourselves is paraded: child-murder, flogging in the army, maltreatment of lunatics; and everything that the newspapers bring to light, from a dead body discovered, to a letter treacherously opened (she considers this last a practice peculiar to our Government), is raked up as though an *œuvre* might prevent them, as though indeed they were distinctly national characteristics, which justify the loss of the patriotic sense, observable in more instances than the present one. These pages are furious against the leniency of our juries, and charge the nation with infanticide; a charge easily retorted where there are so many parents who cast off the charge of their children, indifferent whether they live or die.

All our attempts at reformation and amendment are ridiculed and despised. If a man, not a *frère*, devotes himself to teaching children, he is a *gaping* Englishman, and the children are stupid children; if an Englishwoman, not a *sœur*, interests herself for the suffering, she is twitted with Exeter Hall, with bazaars and charity-balls, indiscriminately; and called names, 'sentimental' and 'evangelical.' Indeed, nothing is more striking than the profound ignorance discernible in these pages, and in persons of similar temper and views, of the real work that is going on in

England; all that is involved in the parish system, when carried out; the simple charities, the constant unostentatious intercourse for instance that goes on between an active English Churchwoman and the poor within her reach and influence. This ignorance certainly excuses our suspicion, that previous to her change of religion this lady had not made herself acquainted, either by practice or observation, with the condition of the poor of this country, or the bearing of our Church towards them. There is something in the tone and manner of detailing cases of destitution and visits of investigation which implies no previous practice in visiting, no disinterested experience of the habits, requirements, and sufferings of the poor. The impression sought to be conveyed, that the poor are always in extremity of destitution, that every one who sallies forth to assist them will have his feelings harrowed by naked and famishing children, huddled together before dying embers, all shows the absence of calm practical acquaintance with the subject. It is acquired partly from printed statements of destitution, partly from a desire to enhance the merit of labours in her adopted Church, which do not need these highly coloured adornments, and which, we believe, the practical, really experienced 'sisters' themselves would hardly sanction or recognise as a just picture. We do not mean that in large cities there is not a grievous amount of extreme want,—our papers call attention to it as every winter comes round,—but it is an outrage on Providence, as well as on fact, to assume that utter destitution is everywhere the normal condition of a large section of mankind. Perhaps the country of this lady's preference may encourage the tone of feeling; at any rate she recommends herself to French readers by it, for we are told by one who knows Paris well—

'When the French visit England, their first care is to hasten to Bethnal Green or Whitechapel, to gloat over the misery there to be found. In a sort of vague, dreamy form, the information collected by our Sanitary Commissioners has been carried over to France, where it causes the breasts of all true patriots to swell with delight, on the same principle that we might be pleased at finding that one of our enemies was afflicted with a cancer. The French keep their eyes so fixed upon our cancers that they fancy us all cancer.'—B. ST. JOHN'S *Purple Tints*, vol. i. p. 105.

It is possible that the organization of their own destitution may make it seem to the French less a blot. Our authoress devotes a great deal of space and descends to infinite minutiae in describing the class of *chiffonniers*, a body of 6,000 strong, who have their rules, their *esprit de corps*, and their own hotels, their clubs, so to say; men and women who live by scraping among dust-heaps, and some of them, poor unfortunates, by eating the offal that they find there. It is not in the English nature to

organize such misery, or to be otherwise than misanthropical under it. The good and the bad in us render it alike impossible, as in their case their cheerful adaptation to circumstances and their hopeless facility of *sinking* after a certain pass accounts for it. It is notorious that this miserable band which carries the *hotte*, the *crochet*, and the lantern, numbers among its members families of the *ancienne noblesse*. We read of one who, on being asked what o'clock it was, answered by a quotation from Horace. The present writer says:—

‘Every one in Parisian society a few years ago, would have remembered a distinguished officer, whose lofty and intelligent air, and noble demeanour at the head of his regiment were at that time the theme of general admiration. A few years more, and he was to be seen divested of every distinction; his frame bent, his gait listless, his step tottering, as he walked feebly along with the help of a stick. His cheek was pallid and sunken, his brow furrowed, and only shaded by a few straggling grey hairs, while his eye, once so quick and beaming, was now hollow and meaningless. His garments—evidently never made for him—were tattered and dirty, his hat was bent and brimless, his feet were seen through his torn and shapeless boots. How could so sad a metamorphosis have come about? alas, it was the old story—general revolution and individual ruin. Adversity had been at work; discouragement followed loss of position; self-respect was annihilated, and little by little he became what he now is—a wandering *chiffonnier*.’

‘Among the families of the *ancienne noblesse* who have sought in Paris a hiding-place in these hovels, is one which must be known to many; it is that of the Comte de M——, one member of whose family was an *avocat-général* under Charles X. This portion of it consisted of father, mother, son and daughter, and the wife’s brother, also of noble lineage. When they first left their province to come to Paris, they still possessed from the wrecks of their property some few relics of their original splendour, which they brought with them to the great capital. . . . Some were sold to meet the demands of daily expenditure, others were seized as security for rent they were unable to pay. Their destitute owners were driven from lodging to lodging, each being inferior in calibre to the last, and were at length compelled to take up their abode in a cellar to which access could only be gained by a ladder under the street. In this subterranean cavern lived this once honoured family. Misery and despondency the most profound, and demoralisation of a character scarcely conceivable, poisoned the very air they breathed. The interior of this den was calculated to strike consternation into the hearts

' of those who visited it. The men had a wild and alarming expression, which was not diminished by the unshorn and unkempt state of their beards and hair. . . . At length the father betook himself to the *hotte* and the *crochet*; he lived the life, and ate the fare, and kept the hours of the Paris *chiffonnier*. But he grew rapidly old under the effort; his senses became more deadened, and he seemed to be reduced to a mere living machine. One day he was picked up, as he returned from his day's work, in a state of complete stupefaction, by the *Petites Sœurs*, who conveyed him to their asylum. Under their fostering benevolence he partially regained his senses, and with them some faint traces of his once refined features. He died under their care—reconciled to his fate and to God.'—*Realities of Paris Life*, vol. i. p. 319.

It may be the tendencies we see at work in deterioration like this, in this facility of descent, that led the republican M. de Toqueville to maintain that his countrymen have so great an affinity with the savage, that 'when brought in contact with wild tribes they degenerate towards them instead of elevating them.' In other instances we read of the same fall as more cheerfully borne; though the degradation and loss of refinement is the same, the spirit of making the best of things still remains.

But if the French can be cheerful under the reverses of fortune, much more in voluntary privation; their cheerfulness, their liveliness of mind, in the midst of the self-denying labours this book so zealously records, is the impression which takes place of all others. The vivacity of exclamation (oaths we should call them in English) with which these pious people inaugurate their conversation on the most serious subjects, gives a perpetual sense of careless jollity, and lightens to our own feelings the weight of austerities which seem the heavier (as it would appear) because we do not share them.

In all that we have said reflecting on the tone of this writer towards the country and Church of her birth, we have desired carefully to discriminate. Her praise of the good works so zealously carried on in Paris is good so far as it is dictated by a genuine candid admiration; but when repeated merely to set off and enhance systematic disparagement of England, it raises suspicion, and must be accepted with caution. Where a person sees only good in one system of action and only evil in another, both alike having at heart the service of God and our neighbour, both alike subject to human infirmity and shortcomings—where she estimates one by its intentions, the other by its failures, it is very certain that the facts on both sides will need sifting. The book is curious mainly as the work of a convert—or *pervert* shall we call it in this instance, where so much wilful per-



versity and obliquity of judgment is apparent?—and exhibits in broad colours the dangers incident to a change of faith, founded, as far as these writings show, on hasty or insufficient or external grounds—a change supported by prejudice and justified by misrepresentation. Those who read with the caution which the whole style and tone readily prompt, will find many of the details valuable, the facts interesting, and the various schemes and efforts, elaborately particularised, deserving of all respect and admiration for the motives which instigated them, while not a few are worthy of direct imitation.

---

- ART. VII.—1. *Journal of Convocation*. 1854—1858. Rivingtons.
2. *Liturgical Revision*. By the Rev. C. H. DAVIS. With an Introduction by Lord EUBY. Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday. 1859.
3. *Church Questions*. By the Rev. C. ROBINSON, LL.D. Hatchard and Co. 1859.

THE revision of the Prayer-book—is it, or is it not, desirable? is a question in itself most momentous, and, at the present time, of pressing importance. The maintenance of the Christian faith in its purity and completeness depends essentially on the authorised formularies of the Church. Therein are contained, expressly or implicitly, the great doctrinal truths of our religion. Thence is derived the practical and devotional character which is the growth and consequence of a real belief. Above all, if we keep in mind that the mode and manner of approaching the Divine Majesty in solemn worship is the question under consideration, we cannot but feel its paramount importance. At the present time, owing to a concurrence of causes, the proposal of revision occupies no small amount of attention, not among the clergy only, but among the laity also. In Parliament as well as in Convocation, though in very different senses, it has been gravely entertained. The time is come for those who desire the welfare of the Church in England to form an intelligent opinion, and to take a decided part for or against revision.

If it is always necessary in any discussion to define clearly and exactly the meaning of the terms that are used, it is especially so in regard to such a phrase as the revision of the Prayer-book. The words are familiar to our ears. They are bandied to and fro in casual conversation, in the columns of newspapers, in sketchy and superficial pamphlets; but their force and significance is lost in vague uncertainty. Many persons may be found advocating revision without knowing what they mean and what they want. Not only is there the widest possible difference of opinion on the kind and measure of change desired by different persons, who may seem at first sight to make common cause, but also and equally on the no less difficult question of the proper way of effecting it. On both points a dangerous confusion of ideas exists even among educated persons. The great distinctive truths embodied in the Prayer-book are, it must be owned, so insufficiently appreciated, and the proper position and office of the Christian Church have been so ignored and misapprehended, that much ignorance and many prejudices must

be removed before the subject can be treated fairly. It will be the aim and endeavour of the following remarks to clear the subject, so far as may be possible, of the manifold perplexities by which, in the minds of many persons, it is encumbered and embarrassed, and to consider a question so momentous calmly and dispassionately, without the bias of partisanship; regarding it in all its various bearings, and endeavouring to weigh justly the reasons which incline the scale to one side or the other.

Of course it must be admitted, on all hands, that the idea of revision, in the abstract, is not unreasonable. It would be an unwarrantable and indefensible assumption to maintain that the Prayer-book cannot, by any possibility, be amended. However excellent already, still, like everything else of human origin, it may be conceived more perfect than it is. The wise and holy men who compiled it were not infallible. Besides, as change is the law of all things earthly, it may need that sort of alteration which is meant by adaptation, in order to be translated, as it were, so as to suit the requirements of a new generation. So much as this may fairly be granted *in limine*. The idea of revision cannot be tabooed as preposterous. It can claim a hearing. But from this point begin the difficulties, as soon as the question is moved from the abstract to the actual—from what might be to what is. Are there really any serious faults of omission or commission in the book? Are they such as to justify incurring the risks always involved in change? Lastly, even if desirable *per se*, are these supposed amendments practicable at the present time?

There are three courses proposed. There is a doctrinal revision, desired, if not by Lord Ebury himself, at all events by some of his clients. There is the revision of a very different kind, which has been recommended by some of the most eminent members of both houses of Convocation; a revision which would preserve the Prayer-book as it is, while supplementing it with an Appendix of Services, composed by rearrangement of those already existing. Lastly, there are persons, of no less weight and authority, who deem it, on the whole, the safest course to keep the Prayer-book exactly as it is, and to rest content with it rather than to risk the dangers of any change.

The idea of any such revision of the Prayer-book as would alter its doctrinal character may be dismissed very summarily. It is simply an impossibility. The small section of clergymen whose petition is adopted and patronised by Lord Ebury, and who are in more ways than one represented by the gentleman whose significant name is Nihill, are strangely mistaken if they suppose that any change such as they desire would be tolerated by their brethren in the Ministry. There may be others who

would wish to see the alteration, if any, made in a diametrically opposite direction; who would like to see the Services of the English Church, if in any way altered, approximated, not towards the Genevan type, but towards that of the Greek and Roman Communions. But there is no likelihood of either change. A great overwhelming mass of the English clergy are unequivocally opposed to any such change at all. It is morally certain, that in the event of the Prayer-book being remodelled after the manner desired by Lord Ebury's petitioners, an immense majority of the clergy would simply adhere to their present Prayer-book, and refuse to recognise the new one, in spite of any penal consequences. But, in fact, it is inconceivable that any parliament, even one reformed on Mr. Bright's principles, could be so infatuated as to face such a national disruption as would ensue. Great and deplorable as is the ignorance and indifference on ecclesiastical matters even of professing churchmen among the laity, any aggression so tyrannical as the attempt to enforce a new Prayer-book on an unwilling clergy at the request of a minority unimportant as in numbers so in character and position, would be too reckless a violation of the rights of conscience. If ever a trial so severe should be allowed by the inscrutable wisdom of Providence to befall the English Church, men will not be wanting in thousands among the clergy to endure loss and suffering for the truth's sake. But those who agitate for a doctrinal revision ought to reflect on the consequences of what they are trying to do. In the vain and hopeless attempt to conciliate the Dissenters—vain and hopeless, for it is the *animus* of Dissent which puts and keeps men in that position, not this or that passage in the Prayer-book—they are taking the likeliest way to precipitate a schism in the English Church, and in all probability an abrupt severance of the ties which hold Church and State together. But, we repeat, there is no danger, provided that all those who are opposed to a doctrinal revision will take the trouble to make their sentiments known. Petitions ought to be presented from every Rural Deanery, signed by clergy and laity alike against it. Above all, the London Declaration, expressing the conviction 'that any such attempt, at the present time, 'would be fraught with great danger to the peace and unity of 'the Church,' ought to be endorsed by the clergy throughout all parts of the kingdom.' If the almost universal feeling of the clergy in favour of preserving the Prayer-book shall once make itself understood, the impending evil will, in all likelihood, be averted.

It is unnecessary here to enter into a vindication of the doctrines of the Prayer-book as it stands. That has been done,

<sup>1</sup> Signatures may be sent to G. H. Davies, Esq., 69, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields.

and done thoroughly, over and over again already. Received and transmitted from the earliest ages of the Christian Church, they have been assailed by some fresh cavil or objection in each succeeding age, and in each age they have been illustrated and enforced by the wisest, most learned, and holiest theologians. Suffice it to say now, in reply to the proposal for a new Prayer-book, that the clergy of England are decided in their conviction that such a thing *cannot be*.

But it may be answered that Lord Ebury disclaims any alteration of doctrines. That amiable and well-meaning nobleman is no doubt sincere in the disclaimer. But probably he is hardly aware where changes of doctrine begin. The Prayer-book is so permeated by the spirit of primitive Christianity; even in its minuter arrangements, it is framed and compacted so carefully on the type of older rituals; so often a great and cardinal principle is involved, if not expressed, by some traditional phrase, or some apparently trifling direction—that no ordinary learning and tact would be required to touch the Prayer-book at all without provoking a theological controversy. But, whatever may be Lord Ebury's intentions, it is easy to see in the two pamphlets, the titles of which are prefixed to these remarks (one of which is endorsed with his name), how delicate and dangerous an undertaking it would be to operate on the Prayer-book. Mr. Davis and his friends rush in where wiser persons would fear to tread. He steps boldly and complacently among the smouldering fires of controversy. His pamphlet is an example of the popular confusion of ideas on the subject. He gravely proposes, almost in the same breath, first, 'to revise the Prayer-book, without altering any 'doctrine in any direction,' and then, 'to alter those few points 'on which unhappy differences have arisen, according to the 'standard of the Thirty-nine Articles.' In this vague and hazy way men speak and think on a subject requiring such careful deliberation, such clearness of intellect, such learning, such profound spiritual wisdom, as the alteration of the Prayer-book. Mr. Davis seems happily unconscious of his inconsistency. Perhaps he would excuse himself on the ground that he asks not for the doctrines to which he takes objection to be directly negatived, but that they should be 'generalised,' and left open to be taken in either sense—either as affirmed or denied. But what is this but to expunge them? So expressed, or rather so denuded of all expression, the truth in question becomes lost by silence. 'De non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio.' When you have subjected the Prayer-book to a process of this kind, eviscerating it of all its distinctive principles, erasing at the arbitrary dictation of each little clique of

sectaries, the peculiar doctrine, however precious to the hearts of others, which does not approve itself to their predilections,—what remains but a lifeless, inorganic residuum, void of form and colour, strangely unlike the clear and majestic outlines of Christian Truth which we have received as a precious legacy from our forefathers in the faith?

For the same reasons, the idea of leaving all the passages, to which exception can be taken, optional, to be used or not at each clergyman's private discretion, is equally inadmissible. Any such course would be simply tantamount to making two Prayer-books—one for those who adhere to the ancient formularies, one for dissentients. Two Books of Common Prayer in real, if not avowed, antagonism:—the one by implication, and in effect, if not in express words, a contradiction of the other! No. Any generalisation of the controverted passages so as to leave the doctrine which they convey no longer there, or any permission to substitute other forms in their stead, must be firmly and strenuously resisted, as equivalent in reality to a new Prayer-book, and equally certain to disquiet and disunite the Church.

It is simply chimerical to fancy that the Dissenters can be restored to the Church by tampering with the Prayer-book in this manner. No amount of concession to their prejudices, no mutilation of the Prayer-book, however ruthless, would satisfy the insatiable craving which is the animating principle of Dissent. If each sect had free liberty to pare away those parts of the Prayer-book to which it feels repugnance, the residuum would be almost nothing. If, besides, they were allowed, as they would not unnaturally expect, to introduce their own peculiar tenets, the result would be an incongruous and unintelligible patchwork. But in neither case would they be content. So long as ignorance and misconception prevail, so long as men's minds are swayed by self-will and self-conceit instead of by reverence and humility, there will still be Dissenters. No doubt there are always a certain number of Dissenters not by deliberate choice, but by accident—not by fault of their own, but owing to external causes. At the present time in this country a large proportion of Dissent is of this kind, not accountable for its own existence, the result of past neglect and of an overpowering increase of population. Dissenters of this kind may and will, with the Divine blessing, be restored to the fold, as the Church more and more zealously fulfils its mission. But they must come to the truth: it cannot be cut and fashioned to suit their fancy. The Christian faith is a sacred deposit committed to the Church, to be preserved whole and entire for all ages. The Church has no right to compromise it in any way by suppression of any part, in order



to please human preconceptions. The suppression of the truth is the same thing as the promulgation of error. The Church is bound by fidelity to our Divine Lord and Master to keep his truth unchanged, as it is in its own transcendent nature unchangeable, till the end of the world. But it is needless to insist on what must be evident to any thoughtful mind unwarping by party spirit. The utter futility of any such comprehension of Dissenters as we have been speaking of is plain even from the admissions of its most eager advocates. Mr. Davis, after enumerating the various and important alterations of doctrine which he recommends, is constrained to confess a misgiving, not only 'how far agreement could be secured to such alterations,' but 'whether or not they would satisfy, provided they could be obtained.' Dr. Robinson appears more sanguine as to the success of his scheme for the restoration of unity, but it is truly an extraordinary one. He proposes, with the utmost naïveté, that 'each denomination should prepare a service for themselves out of the Book of Common Prayer, omitting such prayers and canticles as they 'object to,' and then that this motley group of Prayer-books should all be sanctioned for the respective congregations by the Bishops of the Church! Dr. Robinson has certainly discovered a new way of promoting unity. If this be all which can be said in favour of the comprehension of Dissenters by altering the Prayer-book, the scheme will not gain many adherents. We repeat that dissentients must alter themselves to the Truth, it cannot be altered to them. The more clearly and unfalteringly the Church proclaims her heavenly message, the more distinctly she announces the spiritual blessings which she alone is commissioned to convey to mankind, the more likely it is that the wanderers may be recalled to her fold. It is mainly because men have become blind to the great truth that there is one only divinely-appointed way of salvation—one only channel for diffusing throughout the world the blessings which flow from the Cross—that so many have turned from the living waters to hew out shallow and soon-exhausted cisterns for themselves. Real unity among Christians is a priceless treasure; but the hollow delusion of professed union, without real unity, is not worth purchasing at any price, most certainly not at the cost of any sacrifice of the truth. First, and above all things, truth; next, and secondarily, peace, ought to be the desire of every Christian.

The pamphlets which have been already referred to are only valuable as indicating, with more precision than usual, the chief alterations in the Prayer-book which are demanded by those whom the authors may be supposed to represent. Dr. Robinson's fitness to pronounce an opinion on liturgical questions

may be estimated not only from his extraordinary panacea for dissent, which we have already mentioned, but from other passages in his pamphlet. In proposing to substitute a Collect from the Communion Service for the present Absolution, he prefixes to it a Rubric, directing the clergyman to 'stand up and pronounce this absolution.' There may be conceivable reasons why the priest should stand, as is customary in some other instances, while offering up this prayer, but how can saying a prayer by any possibility be called pronouncing an absolution? Mistakes like this show a fatal ignorance of the very simplest principles of divine worship. Again, in criticising the Ordination Service, he betrays a lamentable confusion in his mind even on so fundamental a part of the Christian faith as the office and operations of the Holy Ghost. He objects to the words 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' that they are out of place, inasmuch as the candidate for the priesthood has already professed his belief that he is inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost; as if the grace by which every good desire is stirred and fostered within the heart, and which is common to all Christians, were the same thing as the gift of spiritual power to exercise an holy office which is communicated by the laying on of hands in ordination. We are not now concerned to defend this service against its impugnors; we are merely instancing with what insufficient knowledge and indistinctness of ideas men venture to pronounce an opinion on the highest and most awful questions. In the same unconsciousness of what he is doing, he thinks that by 'leaving out some twenty-five words' here, and 'some thirty-five words' there (without considering how much would be involved by the omission of those few short sentences), the Prayer-book might be improved so as to give general satisfaction! Mr. Davis's theological knowledge and reasoning are of the same order. In endeavouring to impart a more 'Protestantistic' character, as he calls it, to the Prayer-book, he quotes largely from such sources as a Presbyterian Free Church Review, and other similar periodicals. He lays a great stress on the fact of the Prayer-book having been revised more than once already; as if that were not a 'raison de plus' for expecting, on 'à priori' grounds, that it does not require to be revised again. His argumentation throughout is not of a very solid texture, and will hardly succeed in convincing any but those who are beforehand determined to agree with him. We need not waste further time on brochures so crude and inconclusive as these. May the Prayer-book be saved from such manipulation as it would experience, if every one, qualified only by his opinion of his own competency, is to lay rash hands upon it.

It is no new thing in the history of the English Church, this

eager craving for change, combined with a slight and superficial theology. There has always been a section within the Church more considerable for zeal than for learning and discretion, not heartily sympathising with the traditional teaching of the Church, and more or less disposed to fraternise with the seceders from it. Not seldom in the last century men of high purpose and earnest devotion were inclined in this direction chiefly from the general apathy and indifference of those about them. But now, in the wakening energy of the Church, the case is changed. Every year gradually and insensibly draws men of this character, though born and bred amid the associations of Dissent or semi-Dissent, nearer and nearer to those who hold fast the received belief of the early Church. As time goes on, and as men of opposite parties come mutually to a better understanding, and learn to meet on common ground, it may confidently be hoped that old suspicions and prejudices will be dissipated, and the English Church present a more compact and united front against the heathenism and immorality that we have to contend with. The Formularies, as they are now, afford a bond of union which, without too closely circumscribing the instinctive tendencies of either party, holds both parties together, and facilitates their arriving in time at more perfect agreement. But this gradual approximation of high and low churchmen would be rudely stopped, and a yawning chasm would open itself between the two parties, if these Formularies were to be changed. Instead of blindly and restlessly grasping at a change which could only satisfy the one party by extruding the other, it were better to acquiesce in the providential dispensation which has given us a framework admitting some diversity of opinion on controverted points, with a strict regard to general orthodoxy of belief. At any rate, a time like the present is peculiarly ill-suited for revision.

The objections made to certain parts of the Prayer-book are often based on a misconception. Many persons form a distorted idea of the doctrine which they fancy intended, and waste their strength in fighting a shadow. It may be worth while to consider very briefly the chief points in controversy, in order to show how much nearer would be the unity of the Church, not if the passages in question were altered (for that, as we have shown, is out of the question), but if they were more clearly and duly understood.

It is a trite remark that the English Church allows a certain amount of latitude on controverted questions. But we must be careful as to the sense in which alone this remark is true. The latitude is not in regard to the objective truth in its own essential nature, but subjectively as to the precise manner of

expressing it. Invariably the mystery is enunciated, so plainly as to preclude mistake, in its great eternal outlines; but no attempt is made—hopelessly impossible as it always proves—to define rigorously and in set terms what must always remain beyond the reach of the human understanding. Let us take in order the chief points in dispute, and we shall see how much room there is for those differences of opinion which result necessarily from the diversities of human idiosyncrasies, without losing for a moment our firm grasp on the great substantial verities of Revelation. The interminable dispute on Predestination is left by our formularies logically undecided, without any attempt to solve what is insoluble, and to reconcile within the narrow limits of the human intellect the two apparently irreconcilable principles, each in itself practically true, of the Divine foreknowledge overruling all things on the one hand, and of man's perfect free agency on the other. So again on the doctrine of Sacramental grace. It is clearly stated, in terms of which men have been unable though desirous to evade the force, that in the one Sacrament the child is born again; and, in the other, that a Real Divine Presence consecrates the elements of bread and wine; but how this wondrous spiritual change is effected, and to what precise degree—in what way and how far the sinful nature is changed by the Baptismal waters, and fresh communication of life divine imparted in the Holy Eucharist—is left for the revelations of that time when we shall 'know as we are known.' In both cases the English Church recites the formula of Holy Writ, without presuming to dogmatise more exactly on its significance. A new birth in Baptism is indeed affirmed, as in Holy Scripture, so by the English Church; but men are not required to assent to any definition, how far the original nature of mankind is abolished, or how far it still remains to thwart and hinder the new life in the soul. Very often persons may be found objecting to Baptismal Regeneration, as if by the term was intended a belief that the soul is from Baptism actually rather than potentially sanctified. Similarly objection is made to the doctrine of the Real Presence, and to the spiritual sacrifice in the Holy Communion, as if assent were demanded to some logically impossible statement. But invariably the Church simply repeats the words of Him who is the Truth, and delivers them to the faithful believer unrestricted by the subtle refinements of dogmatic phraseology. There is no attempt to adapt to human reason what is of necessity above, though not contrary to, reason. So again in the Ordination Service it is not an uncommon mistake, as we have already seen, to suppose that the words, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' imply the gift of some superior personal holiness,—

not, as they really do, the gift of the Holy Spirit for ministrations in the Church. If men would but realise distinctly the independence of the office and the person who holds it; if they would open their eyes to the fact that the messengers of Christ are merely messengers, not acting with inherent authority, but simply as ministers even in the most solemn exercise of their deputed powers; and that the message of blessing and pardon is entirely provisional, and conditional on the state of the heart in the eyes of the only all-seeing Judge; then they would cease to be scandalised, as they sometimes are now, at the doctrine of Absolution. Again, no subject has occasioned more acrimonious controversy than Private Confession. Here again the Church of England leaves a certain discretion as to the use of the ordinance. The principle is plainly sanctioned; the practical application of it is left, as in reason it ought, to be determined by circumstances. The popular outcry against Confession would not have been roused, if it had been clearly understood that Confession to a priest is not required in the Prayer-book as necessary in order to receive his message of forgiveness. For receiving advice and direction common sense shows that private confession is necessary; but for Absolution, repentance alone is requisite, which may evidently exist even where there is no confession.<sup>1</sup>

In the same uncompromising, yet tolerant spirit, the Prayer-book speaks of Fasts and Feast-days, without imposing any minute regulations of diet. A wise liberty is allowed in the application of the principle to the cases of individuals. The scruples that are felt by some persons on both these points arise, as usual, from a misconception. Their scruples about so plainly scriptural a practice as Fasting would cease, if they would only look through what they choose to regard as a mere outward formality, to the deep evangelical principle of self-denial which underlies it; nor would they object to the observance of Saints'-days, if they were brought to see that the honour paid in such observances is not paid to the faithful servants of Christ, but to Him from whom alone all their graces are derived.

Lastly, the scruples which some persons feel against the use of the Athanasian Creed would be removed, if they would but understand that what they erroneously call the damnatory clauses, are really and truly minatory; a warning such as Christian charity requires to be uttered, not a sentence of condemnation; and that even in this point of view an intentional, so to speak,

---

<sup>1</sup> We are not speaking here of the extraordinary cases for which a special Absolution is provided in the Prayer-book, but of the ordinary ministrations of forgiveness in the public services of the Church. Both the public Absolutions, though differing in form, alike convey pardon to the penitent.

not a formal or literal assent is implied by the words 'which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.'

Another point in the Prayer-book, though of far less importance, to which exception is taken, is the custom of requiring the sponsors to answer in the name of the child. Here again the difficulty is more imaginary than real; the fancied confusion of responsibility, on which the objection is grounded, exists rather in the mind of the objector than in the ordinance itself. Nor can much weight be fairly attached to the repugnance which Mr. Davis and others manifest to some parts of the Marriage Service. Who will say that with the present low tone of morality, both in town and country, the solemn warnings against impurity are not needed? Granting that the language of the admonition is plainer and more outspoken than accords with modern usage, still that is no valid reason for altering it. The outward and superficial delicacy of speech, which is part of our modern civilisation, is no certain warrant for real inward purity. On fitting occasions it is most salutary to break through the reserves of social conventionality, in order to touch the hidden springs of thought and feeling. The solemn celebration of holy matrimony is, without question, such an occasion, justifying the seeming violation of social propriety, which would otherwise be inexpedient and wrong. Language which would be out of place and unbecoming among lighter and less reverend associations, falls with a chastened sound on the heart at such a moment, when the mysterious bond of union for life and for death is being sealed between man and wife in the presence of the Most High. But we need not dwell on this point. The too fastidious scruples, which used not long ago to lead to the mutilation of the Marriage Service, are very infrequent now. There is a more general feeling of the necessity for speaking plainly, if at all, in the way of exhortation; and the deepening sense of the awfulness of holy places and holy rites counteracts the morbid fear of apparent indelicacy, which we have been speaking of. These scruples, we repeat, are not now of wide prevalence; and, like many others of the kind, vanish before a little reflection.

We have another imaginary difficulty, though of a still more minute kind, in the objection to the words 'most religious' as applied to the reigning sovereign. Of course there is no real difficulty at all. They are applied, like the title 'Defender of the Faith,' to the office, not to the person. Good King George III., whom Mr. Davis quotes, showed his humility rather than his common sense in saying that instead of 'Most religious King,' it ought to be 'the most miserable sinner.' Some other of the many alterations proposed are too trivial to deserve much notice; for example, the substitution of 'Morning'



and 'Evening' Prayer, for 'Matins' and 'Evensong,' 'Festival' for 'Feast,' and 'day by day' for 'this day' in the Lord's Prayer. Certainly there is such a thing as a *cacœthes emendandi*.

But there is one point of real importance which ought not to be overlooked. A tendency may be discerned in some quarters, as in these pamphlets, to wish to alter what are called the 'obsolete phrases' in the Prayer-book, such as are found, for example, in the Marriage Service. But where is the necessity? From having been used continually and generally, such phrases can never really become obsolete. They present no difficulty even to the uneducated persons who fail to understand their exact meaning. Evidently, on merely literary considerations, it would be a great mistake to obliterate these racy and idiomatic relics of our old English tongue. But they are valuable for higher reasons also. They are venerable from their age, and familiar by long usage; they form a link between successive generations who have knelt in the same holy places, and joined in the same holy services. The loss in this respect would far outweigh the trifling advantage of making the service rather more universally intelligible. It would be a fatal error to abandon the time-honoured diction of the Prayer-book, by modernising and simplifying it, for the sake of attaining what is really unattainable and most undesirable,—a form of Prayer lowered to the level of every one's comprehension.

But it is in the attempt to shorten and rearrange the services that popular reformers of the Prayer-book betray their incompetency most egregiously. Not very long ago a clergyman, of great repute as a preacher, the incumbent of a large town parish, put forth a scheme for rearranging the Sunday services, a prominent feature of which was a celebration of the Holy Communion *in the evening*, in disregard of the prescriptive custom of the Catholic Church, and in apparent ignorance of the important considerations on which that custom is grounded! We mention this as one instance among many others. Both the writers before us try their hands at this work, as if it were the easiest thing in the world. We must defer this subject for the present, till we come to consider the Reports of Convocation, in which it occupies an important place. But we must observe, in passing, that we look in vain for any regulating principles of reconstruction in these pamphlets. We find no reference either to the great standard treatises of our old divines on the Prayer-book, or to the no less valuable works of living authors, such as Jebb, Freeman, Palmer, &c. The one writer would curtail a few verses from most of the Canticles, as if the sense would remain unimpaired. The other would omit, strange to say, the *Second Lesson* from one of the Services. Both seem agreed,

if not in other details of their plans, to demur to the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, as if all repetitions were alike included under the censure pronounced against '*vain repetitions*;' as if there were no precedent in the garden of Gethsemane for repeating the same words of fervent prayer more than once, and as if that divine prayer did not occur with fresh significance and appropriateness, however often it may be used in the Service. It is wearying to hear this continual outcry against any prayer, but especially this prayer, being recited more than once in the same Service. The writers in question seem perfectly unaware that the various Services which of late years have been combined into one long Morning Service on Sunday, may be used separately, as seems to have been originally intended. Crude and ill-advised suggestions, such as those which have been mentioned, framed on no guiding principles, unauthorised by liturgical precedents, the result of hasty and inconclusive reasonings, cannot be too earnestly deprecated. It is really like a child pulling a watch to pieces, and vainly trying to readjust in proper order its exquisite and intricate mechanism. These two pamphlets are not in themselves in any way remarkable: but they are samples of the rash and mischievous innovation which threatens the Prayer-book at this time. If anything really must be done in the way of forming new Services, it must be done in a very different way.

It is a relief to turn from the incoherent and unpractical projects of these self-constituted reformers to the Reports of Convocation. There we find the same subject, the revision of the Prayer-book, brought forward more than once in the last few years. Both Houses have pronounced—the Upper with perfect unanimity, and the Lower with only one or two faintly dissentient voices—that the 'Prayer-book ought to be preserved entire and unaltered.' But, on the further question of introducing supplementary Services, we find some difference of opinion. Certainly, if Convocation has done nothing else, it has afforded a good opportunity for the ventilation of important questions, not only by eliciting the opinions of the most eminent of the clergy in both Houses in the course of discussion, but also by the Reports resulting from the more silent labours of the Committees. Whatever may be the defects in its present constitution, it represents and gives utterance as nothing else does to the sentiments of the Church of England. It is worth while to trace its proceedings on this subject.

In 1854 a Joint Committee of both Houses reported in favour of dividing the Services, and of adding some new Occasional Services, 'to be formed from the Prayer-book.' In February,

1855, a debate ensued in both Houses on this Report. After considerable discussion, certain resolutions proposed by the Bishop of Oxford were finally carried in the Upper House, to the effect that some modification in regard to the Services is desirable, but only so far as concerns the Rubric, the division of the Services, the Psalter, and the Table of Lessons. It was agreed that these resolutions should be embodied in any address that might be presented to the Crown. A very similar resolution was passed by the Lower House; with this difference, that they insisted on restricting the alteration of the Rubric, Psalter, and Lessons by the following limitation: 'only so far as may be necessary for the division of the old and formation of new Services.' Most of our readers, we think, will concur with the Lower House in wishing to narrow, as far as possible, the alterations required. Waiving for the present the question, which is no easy one, of the legal possibility of altering the Rubric without an Act of Parliament (a question which seems to affect any alteration of the Calendar as well as of the Rubric), there is an important distinction in another point of view to be drawn: any project for altering the Rubric would be the beginning of controversy.

But to return to Convocation. The subject was resumed after a considerable interval, in February, 1859. The Bishop of Oxford, with all the persuasiveness of his earnest eloquence and commanding intellect, urged the expediency of appending six or seven occasional services to the Prayer-book, and thought that this could be done by licence from the Crown, without any recourse to Parliament. But the Bishops were divided in opinion; some feared the danger of stirring the question of revision at all; others doubted this licensing power alleged to reside in the Queen's prerogative. The motion was lost, but only by the casting vote of the President. Meantime, a resolution of similar tendency had been agreed to in the Lower House. So the question waits for the present; in all probability to be revived and re-considered at the next meeting of Convocation.

In the cautiousness and deliberation of this movement, there is nothing to cause surprise or regret. Many and serious are the considerations involved. Granting, for the moment, that there is much to be desired—that shorter and more diversified services would be a great gain, especially in the present state of our population; allowing all due weight to the argument that a wise and moderate reform is the best preventive of resolution; still one great difficulty stops the way. How can such alterations be made, in the face of the Act of Uniformity, without permission of Parliament;—a Parliament no longer

consisting of even nominal Churchmen, but influenced in no slight degree by interests hostile to the Church, and singularly unqualified by temperament and constitution to act as a tribunal in such a matter as the revision of the Prayer-book? It arises, we conceive, from a sense of this danger,—a danger which indeed can hardly be overrated, that we find some of those who usually sympathise with Bishop Wilberforce, hesitating to commit themselves to unreserved agreement with his proposal.

But we must be clear on this point. We are not disputing for one moment that Parliament has a voice in the matter. The two Houses of Parliament, together with the Crown, represent the nation, and as such are one of the two parties to the compact between Church and State. This compact rests on the principle that the formularies once approved and ratified cannot be altered without consent of both parties. The State has clearly the right of withholding the legal sanction of its authority to any alteration which it disapproves. Otherwise the State might find itself continuing to support and uphold a religion changed in doctrine and practice from the first intention. It may refuse its assent; and if the alteration be persisted in, it may even withdraw the temporal privileges which it has conferred. There is no grievance or injustice so far. All this is plainly involved in the very idea of an established Church. But this is all. The State may accept or reject alterations proposed by the Church; and might even proceed, in case of the Prayer-book being altered without its consent, though this would be an extreme measure, to refuse to observe any longer a contract, which, it might contend, had been broken; but it has no right to enact any alterations of its own motion; no right even to take this or that part of the scheme proposed by the Church, so devising in fact a scheme of its own. It must accept or reject *in toto*. Now the danger is, that this important distinction would at the present time be disregarded. It is extremely unlikely that Parliament would consent to pass an enabling Act to authorize the Church to make new Formularies; that such a permission would be granted, implying, as it would, an assent by anticipation, seems out of the question. Nor in all probability would Parliament be content simply to say 'yes' or 'no' to any plan of alteration laid before it. Probably the plan would be discussed in detail;—the most inconsiderate suggestions would be proffered, and perhaps adopted;—and questions which ought to be calmly and deliberately considered by a conclave of Churchmen only, would be rudely handled by a miscellaneous assembly composed not entirely even of nominal Christians.

Clearly the Prayer-book cannot be altered without a new Act of Uniformity, to repeal the force of the 36th Canon as

it now stands. Equally certain is it, that there are reasons which make an appeal to Parliament for this purpose a most dangerous step at this time. When the Church of England becomes, as we may reasonably hope it will in time, more united in itself, more adequately represented by synods, gathered not from one province nor consisting only of ecclesiastics; when the various questions of the connexion between Church and State shall be no longer, as they are now, in process of solution, but decided one way or the other, then the Church will be in a position to make whatever alterations may be really necessary; and to claim for them, with more authority than at present, the ratification of the State; or, if the course of events should be overruled by Providence, as seems not unlikely, to the gradual separation of Church and State, to proceed without the intervention of Parliament at all. Looking to either contingency, it seems the wisest course to wait.

But something can be done, it is said, and with apparent reason, without Parliament. The Bishop of Oxford, though guarding himself from being supposed to speak positively, referred to legal authorities as supporting his view of the practicability of legalising new services without the help of Parliament. The same argument has been urged by Mr. Massingberd, a very competent authority, in an interesting letter which appears in the '*Journal of Convocation*,' vol. i. He there cites several precedents from the reign of Elizabeth downwards, tending to show that the Crown has continually possessed and exercised this 'dispensing power' of authorising special services, drawn up by the Church, to be used without any violation of the Act of Uniformity. The special services of Thanksgiving and Humiliation, which emanate so frequently from the same source, and are generally received without question, as well as the custom of Parliament attending services ordered only by the Crown, go to prove the same thing. The scope of these precedents can hardly be extended so as to cover any infringement on the Prayer-book as it stands, even in its calendar of Lessons, but they appear to warrant the addition of new services to be used as occasion requires.

But, supposing this mode of proceeding to be practicable, what are the particular points to which a Royal Commission of Bishops and other divines ought to direct their attention? Several new services have been suggested. A service of Thanksgiving for any especial public blessings, not for harvest-time only, but such as might be suitable on other similar occasions, is perhaps one of the chief desiderata. For, ever since the Reformation, a less jubilant and more penitential tone has pervaded our services. A Form of Humiliation and

Deprecation, in times of pestilence, or of any other public calamity, is less urgently needed; we have one already in the Litany, and for extraordinary occasions in the Communion Service.<sup>1</sup> Another service, the want of which is often felt, is one for the restoration to the Communion of the Church of those who have fallen away from it. A form of prayer for a blessing on the Missions of the Church has been spoken of, but this want is not a very pressing one. Still less has any case been made out for a Children's Service, an innovation of a most objectionable kind. The adoption of any such service, in the preposterous though popular idea of making all things plain to their understanding, would be virtually an estrangement of the younger members of the Church from their share in common prayer. Mr. Jebb, in a thoughtful and interesting letter, in the 'Journal of Convocation,' vol. i., has demonstrated most convincingly the absurdity of such a scheme; 'public prayer for classes,' for the young, for example, as distinct from the old, being, as he remarks, 'a feature not to be found in any Liturgy.' Perhaps an exception to this ought to be made in the case of Prison Services. A congregation of criminals seems really to require a special form of prayer, not one intended for persons in full enjoyment of their spiritual privileges. A short, simple, fervent service for the sake of the neglected and almost heathenish masses to be found in our great towns, to be used in church after an open-air service in the vicinity, would perhaps be a gain; but the Litany would suffice almost as well as any new service, for the purpose. Anything like a form of prayer to be used in schoolrooms or any other unconsecrated building, ought not to be thought of. We are too apt in these days to forget, that the House of God is the especial place where his presence dwells, and where, most of all, He may be sought and found. A form of Prayer for Consecration of Churches and Churchyards is wanted. The opportunity might be taken while framing and authorising these new services, to revise and improve the service for the Accession Day, and to give the formal assent of Convocation to it. These appear to be the new services that are required. We presume that they would be ordered to be used at the discretion of each Bishop in his own diocese. In cases of national rejoicing or humiliation, there would be a *consensus* of the Episcopal Bench generally.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The notion of having a fixed day every year set apart for national thanksgiving or humiliation, which some members of the Lower House seemed to entertain, is not very intelligible.

<sup>2</sup> Convocation, even with its present imperfect organisation, still as representing 'de facto' the Church of England, seems quite competent to address the Queen for



Anything more than such occasional services as these which we have mentioned, however much to be desired, seems hardly attainable by the exercise of the Crown's prerogative. But, to some extent, a remedy is near at hand, without even this extraneous assistance. The long service on Sunday morning is, or rather was, a grievance of this kind; we say a grievance, for the Sunday Morning Service is certainly too long for most persons to enjoy it as they ought: besides, the symmetry and significance of the several parts is marred by the combination. It is now an established fact that its component services may be used separately, wherever it may be desirable. Many town churches have already taken advantage of this permission, which comes now supported not only by the dictates of common sense, but by the express approval of the Bishops. Plainly there is nothing in the Prayer-book to forbid or discountenance this division of services. The more closely the history of the Prayer-book is investigated, the more incontestable it seems that the modern custom of combining the several services into one rests on no real authority. Mr. Massingberd, whose opinion carries weight, not only from his learning but from his well-known candour and fairness, has contributed some useful facts bearing on this point. In his letter, published in the '*Journal of Convocation*,' after citing Bishop Sparrow's opinion, he lays especial stress on the fact that the Bishops in the Savoy Conference spoke of the Services as distinct. Other proofs may be gathered from the immemorial custom of cathedrals and from history. But they are superfluous now. What we have to follow, in the interpretation of our formularies, is not the intention of those who framed them, but primarily the plain literal and grammatical meaning, in the form providentially delivered to us. We repeat, for it is a point of the utmost importance, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to prove from the Prayer-book that all and any of the ordinary services contained in it may not be used separately at any time by permission of the Bishop. The town congregations are likely more and more to wish to avail themselves of this elasticity. In country parishes, where people come from a distance, and by habit and temper are less impatient of a long service, but, on the contrary, rather like it, there is less need to separate the services. Sometimes the service is rendered tedious less by its own length than by an elaborate and pompous way of '*preaching the prayers*.' This is a defect that may be cured without a Royal Commission. That our services may be used separately, wherever expedient,

---

a Royal Commission to frame such additions to the Prayer-book. The results of that Commission might be submitted, if necessary, to representatives of the Northern Province as well as to the Convocation of Canterbury.

is a fact, now generally admitted, and one leading to most advantageous results.

A third Service for Sunday Evening has been proposed, but seems unnecessary with this division of services. The Litany, with catechising, is often used in the afternoon, and the Evening Service later in the day. Possibly, but we speak under correction, it is not against rule to read the First Lessons for the day in lieu of those for the Sunday afternoon, where the Afternoon Service is simply repeated in the evening. A discretionary power in the Diocesan to order Lessons would be of advantage, but is not compatible, we conceive, with the law at present.

There is scarcely anything more urgently wanted than a short form of daily prayer.<sup>1</sup> In this respect we might wish, if it were possible, to take a hint even from such a source as the Irvingite Prayer-book—a Prayer-book, we may remark in passing, not without great merits. It provides, unless we mistake, a longer and a shorter form for daily use. The omission of the introductory part, or of any other part of our Daily Service—a practice here and there ventured upon—is, of course, quite indefensible, and of most dangerous tendency. While the Daily Prayer remains as it is, we must use it in its integrity. Or why not sometimes substitute the Litany? If it be objected that many persons are deterred by the length of the service from attending it, we must try to meet the evil in another way. Surely it would be far better for persons of scanty leisure to come for *part* of the service on week-days than not at all. Until this practice becomes more familiar to the English nation, the churches will remain almost empty from Sunday to Sunday. Another habit that ought to be encouraged, is that of resorting at spare moments to church for private prayer. It is because we realize so faintly the great truth that a Divine Presence resides in the house of God, there accessible to all who approach it rightly, that we are apt to think more of the congregation than of Him whom they come to worship. Otherwise we should not so often hear the want of a congregation alleged as a reason for not having week-day services. Our Daily Prayer is, it must be owned, not adapted, in its present form, for general use. Still, as we have said, this ought not to deter those who are reasonably hindered from attending during the whole of it, from being present at least during a part, or, if not then, at some other time of the

<sup>1</sup> A short form for common days might be made, when the time shall come, by abridging the Lessons, omitting the Exhortation, and the three Collects 'after the Anthem.' Of course the model of Ancient Services should be followed as far as possible.

day. It is much to be wished that the daily lives of Englishmen were sanctified by the hallowing custom, in these days strangely alien to our habits, of repairing to the house of God for a blessing on their work or their recreation. Even those very persons who feel most strongly the holiness of one day in every week, often most inconsistently appear unable to perceive the corresponding sanctity of particular places.

The second exhortation in the Communion Service, we mean that addressed to the communicants, has sometimes been objected to in Convocation. It has been said that this is calculated to raise disquieting scruples at a time when the hearers are fully prepared to draw near with faith and a quiet mind. We do not deny the force of this objection. But it is reasonably doubted whether that exhortation is not intended only for those occasions when notice of communion is given. It is equivalent to the Presbyterian 'fencing the tables,' and if this view is correct it ought not to be addressed to the communicants: that is, it is not part of the Liturgy, strictly so called.

But our limits forbid us to enlarge on this or other points of a similar kind. Only two difficulties, both of considerable importance, remain, which ought not to be unnoticed. The repugnance to some of the Apocryphal Lessons is not peculiar to the so-called Evangelical party. But we cannot see any legal way of substituting Lessons of a more edifying character than that of Bel and the Dragon. The only remedy seems to be to take opportunities of explaining the true position which the Apocrypha holds according to the Church of England. It is impossible not to wish that our Table of Lessons could be improved. Shorter and more select lections from Holy Scripture would be a great improvement. But it is one which we must be content to wait for, till a fitter time for alteration shall arrive.

The other difficulty is one still more generally felt, and though often overstated, still one that cannot be denied. Almost every day, in one parish or another, proves how ill adapted the Burial Service is for indiscriminate use. But it is not the Service that ought to be altered; it is the indiscriminate use of it. The 4,000 Clergy who remonstrated against this evil, have been misrepresented as asking for alteration in the service; but we feel confident that this, so far from being the general desire, would be deeply regretted. The restoration of primitive discipline is one remedy proposed; but this is a course more easy to speak of than to follow in the present relations of Church and State. Indeed it seems as if it were providentially ordered, that the Church in its maturity should gradually be deprived of the external restraints which were a support in the early growth of

Christianity. Anyhow, the present age is one which cannot be constrained by force in spiritual matters. The practical difficulty of enforcing ecclesiastical censures is insurmountable. What, then, can be done? The present service is evidently adapted, in its tone of joyful confidence, for those who die in full communion. A service less expressive of hope and joy is wanted for such persons as are not communicants. Clearly it cannot and ought not to be left to the Clergy individually to pronounce on the state of the deceased, whatever may be the appearances. But a broad line might be drawn between communicants and others. If such a service can be classed in the category of occasional services, it would be a great boon from a Royal Commission. Meantime it ought to be generally understood that the expressions of hope and thankfulness, properly belonging only to the faithful, are not withheld even from others, *simply because no clergyman has the right, by his own unassisted judgment, to assume that they ought not to be used in any particular case*; whatever misgivings he may be forced to feel as to their being inapplicable.<sup>1</sup>

It is time to conclude these remarks, very inadequate as we feel them to be to the importance and extensiveness of the subject. No doubt, as we commenced by saying, the Prayer-book might be improved. But while admitting this, let us be heartily thankful for what we have already. We have a Prayer-book not only full of heavenly beauty, breathing the wise and holy spirit of ancient times, but dear and precious, in spite of all detractation, to the hearts of the people. Their instinctive affection for it needs to be developed into a more intelligent reverence. The pulpit, by clearly enunciated, but not drily didactic, exposition of the doctrines of the Church, must defend the Prayer-book. For such improvements as cannot safely be attempted now, let us wait hopefully. It would be a great improvement if we had more variety of colour, so to speak, instead of a sort of neutral tint, in our services for different seasons; a more special appropriateness, for example, in the Psalms and Lessons for days of joy or sorrow:—the Catechism also seems to want the insertion of some additional instruction on the nature and office of the ministry: but for these and other such improvements, weighing the preponderating risks attendant on the mode of proceeding, we shall be wise to wait. But till when? We answer, till the Church of England shall feel itself more prepared by matured convictions to undertake the critical task of

<sup>1</sup> A false analogy is sometimes drawn between these expressions of hope and the thanksgiving for regeneration in the Baptism Service. But the cases are by no means parallel. In the infant there can have been no barrier to the divine grace: in the other case there may have been an unholy life frustrating it.

revision; till parties shall have become, as they are becoming, more fused into agreement on cardinal truths, more willing to disagree amicably on minor points; till the laity shall be more sensible of their duties and privileges as members of the Church. The tide of progress is advancing steadily in this direction. What may be the ultimate result of the now unsettled relations between Church and State need be no cause for alarm. If there be life and strength and unity within the Church, we may feel easy about external appliances. Of course, we ought to preserve them as long as we can; but about the issue we need not fear. There are many encouraging signs. Ruri-decanal meetings of clergy and laity, now becoming common, are a great step towards lay-coöperation, and synodical action on a larger scale. The theological colleges are training the clergy in a deeper and more accurate knowledge of theology. The numerous schools for the Middle Classes, now rising everywhere, of the same kind as the great school at Hurstpierpoint, and, among other things, the invaluable practice of public catechising, are indocinating the laity. Everything indicates that a clearer and stronger conviction of the objective truths of religion is extending itself gradually through the Church, even in the face of many hindrances. We may reasonably hope, that in the course of some years the Church will be in a position to enter synodically on the consideration of those further improvements, which seem beyond the scope of the only legislative process at present safely open to us. Let us be content for a time to guard the Prayer-book, as it is, making only such additions to it as seem urgently needed, and are attainable without controversy in the Church, or an appeal to Parliament.

---

## NOTICES.

WE have before us the Prospectus and Publications of the 'MARRIAGE LAW DEFENCE ASSOCIATION,' a Society which was formed some nine months ago to counteract the agitation for legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, and we know not what monstrous alliances besides. The efforts of Messrs. Crowder and Maynard for their rich clients (who first violated the law and then determined, if they could, to alter it) have at length summoned into existence this Society, which bids fair to make their commission continue for some years. They have done good, after all, those pertinacious solicitors; for they have brought together, under a sense of common danger, men of all parties in the Church, whom we would fain see more frequently acting in concert. Among the Committee are found the names of the Duke of Marlborough, Lord Shaftesbury, Lord Campbell, and Lord John Manners; the Bishops of Lincoln, Oxford, and S. David's; the Vice-Chancellor, Sir W. Page Wood; the Archdeacons Hone, Sinclair, Hall, and Bickersteth; the Regius and Margaret Professors of Divinity at Oxford; Mr. Hugh Stowell, Mr. Auriol, Mr. Garbett, Mr. Claughton, Mr. W. R. Freemantle, Mr. Thorold, Mr. Roundell Palmer, Mr. Colquhoun, Mr. B. Hope, and a multitude of others. The Dean of Westminster is the Chairman.

Eight publications have been already issued, and more are to follow. No. 1 is the useful Speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords, which has been reprinted by his Grace's express permission. No. 2 is a Speech by Lord Campbell, who, we were rejoiced to see, declared from the woolsack last session that his aversion to any change in the Law of Marriage remained unabated. No. 3 is a simple and lucid statement of the reasons, apart from those which may fairly be urged from Scripture, for retaining the Law as it is. No. 4 is a reprint of Dr. Hessey's 'Scripture Argument,' which appeared some years since. No. 5 is peculiarly useful, as showing how thoroughly the matter is a 'woman's question.' No. 6 is a selection of articles from public journals, and deals chiefly with the social aspect of the movement. No. 7 contains concise replies to Messrs. Crowder and Maynard's 'twenty-three (alleged) facts,' and converts them into mere fictions. And No. 8, which has just appeared, has for its title, 'Remarks on Dr. McCaul's Plea from Lev. xviii. 18, for marrying a Deceased Wife's Sister.' We commend it to the attention of Churchmen, and especially to that of the Clergy whom Dr. McCaul misrepresents in Convocation as Proctor for the Diocese of London. If there is anything in the criticism of the pamphlet, circulated by the Marriage Law Defence Association, Dr. McCaul's pamphlet—

First, mistakes the point really in question;

Secondly, labours to prove a point beside the question, but fails to prove even that; and,



Thirdly, by abandoning the true method of Scripture interpretation, lays Dr. McCaul open to the imputation of permitting a man to marry, *not merely his deceased wife's sister, but his own or his wife's niece, or even his own daughter.* In fact, to be consistent, Dr. McCaul is bound, in Lord John Russell's words, to 'consider the change of the law utterly imperfect, 'unless it is further altered to make it equally applicable to both sexes, 'and to all the degrees of relationship which have been mentioned.' At the last election for a Proctor for the London Clergy, Dr. McCaul, though declining to pledge himself against the proposed change in the law, if we remember rightly, stated that his own feelings were against the permission of these marriages on the third ground. If Dr. McCaul is again a candidate it will be on a distinct issue. Meanwhile he is in this difficulty :—Does he, now that he believes the permission to be scriptural, retain or recant his social view? If the former, he makes what God permits productive of great social evil. If the latter, it would be well for him to tell his brethren how he has settled his moral difficulty.

Unscriptural, opposed to antiquity, to the laws of England, to the spirit of the Reformation, and to all our domestic feelings, as the agitation against the Marriage Law undoubtedly is, its promoters are wealthy and obstinate, and, we hear, are determined again to apply to Parliament. The following forms of petition against their design have been prepared, and we believe are in many places in course of signature. They may be obtained at the office of the Association, No. 41, Parliament Street. We trust that Churchmen will exert themselves, as they certainly did not last session, not merely by petitioning, but by sending pecuniary aid to the Association.

*Form of Petition against Alteration in the Marriage Law.*

To the RIGHT HONOURABLE the LORDS SPIRITUAL and TEMPORAL of the UNITED KINGDOM of GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND in Parliament assembled :

OR,

To the HONOURABLE the COMMONS of the UNITED KINGDOM of GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND in Parliament assembled :

The Humble Petition of the Undersigned, being Inhabitants [or other description] of

Sheweth,

That your Petitioners view with alarm the attempts which have been so perseveringly made to bring about a change in the Law of Marriage.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray your right honourable [or for the Commons 'your honourable'] House not to pass any Bill that has for its object the legalising of marriage within the degrees now prohibited by Law.

*N.B. All Petitions must be in manuscript, without erasure or interlineation, and one Signature at least must appear on the same sheet as that on which the Petition itself is written. Every Petitioner must sign his or her own name or mark. It will save much trouble if Signatures for the Petitions to both Houses are obtained at the same time.*

*The Petitions to the House of Commons may be posted to the Petitioners' own Representative, to some Member of Parliament belonging to the Association, or to some other Member known to oppose the Bill. Those to the House of Lords, to the Diocesan or to any other Peer.*

*All Petitions sent by post to a Member of either House with the ends open, with the words 'Petition to Parliament' written on the cover, pass postage free, but not otherwise.*

*As Lord Bury's Bill will probably be brought again before the new Parliament this year at a very early date of the Session, those who desire to oppose it are earnestly advised to petition Parliament without delay.*

We are somewhat late in noticing a small volume, entitled 'Athanasius and other Poems.' By a Fellow of a College. (London: Masters.) Those who are fond of truly religious poetry will find in it a union of sound dogmatic teaching with much that is eminently adapted to foster their spiritual life. The versification is smooth and flowing. Amidst much that pleases us, we should select 'Christmas Eve' as our special favourite. The poem which gives the name to the book embodies a large amount of historic lore, which is given with great spirit; but the metre reminds us so strongly of Lord Macaulay's ballad on the Battle of Naseby, that, despite ourselves, an unpleasant association will arise. Report ascribes this little volume to one whom many Scottish Churchmen know to have a deep claim upon their attention, arising from generous and faithful service which has been but ill repaid. It is some satisfaction to know that the person alluded to was offered, as we understand, a home in another institution connected with the Church in Scotland, and only declined it on the ground of a prior claim of duty in England.

'Readings on the History of Joseph and his Brethren' (London: Masters), is the name of a small volume of sermons preached in a country parish. They are well suited to their purpose, and would prove useful for lending libraries. A leading characteristic is the constant reference to the typical character of the events in the patriarch's life. We are very glad to observe this feature. Not only has the application of types a wonderful hold on the human heart,—a hold retained amidst the great possible varieties of age, country, and condition,—but in these days of rationalism it forms a very powerful indirect argument for the unity and supremacy of Holy Scripture—its unity, as connecting the Old Dispensation with Christ; its supremacy, as assigning to Scripture a mark which stamps it as peculiar, and as having its supremacy, as being that Book

Unde nil majus generatur ipso,  
Nec viget quidquam simile aut secundum.

Mr Freeman, the Vicar of Thorverton, Devon, has given to the Church at large four admirable 'Advent Sermons' (London: Masters), preached in the diocese which he now adorns. They are replete with sound and exact theology, brought to bear very closely and searchingly upon the lives of all of us. At the moment when this notice appears, the holy season, to which these discourses specially apply, will have past by; but there is

much which our clerical readers would find useful to their flocks at all times. The third Sermon is in many respects quite as applicable to Lent as Advent.

Christmas brings its characteristic publications. Christmas books have superseded Christmas boxes; and this practical age, as we delight in calling it, becomes especially practical in its *souvenirs*. The thing to be done in a Christmas book is to combine the elements of the useful and the beautiful; good illustrations are not to disguise a bad book, nor is the very best of books a real Christmas book without the smartest of covers and the best of woodcuts. Of late years the trashy flashy annuals, the Keepsakes and Friendship's Offerings of twenty years ago, consisting of fancy portraits of impossible young women, illustrating stories just a trifle more impossible, have been superseded by practical books, as they call them. And, strangely enough, the wheel of time seems to have exhausted the variety of 'illustrated gift-books;' for the volume which was among the first, as it certainly was the best, of the innovators, has reappeared in a second edition some fourteen years after its first publication. We allude to 'Poems and Pictures,' originally published by Burns, and now reproduced by Sampson Low. Mr. Dyce is among the artists employed, and there is a freshness and vigour in his drawings, and in some of those by Cope and Creswick, which certainly has not been exceeded in more recent times, when illustrative woodcuts have become as much a matter of manufacture as of art.—A Christmas book likely to obtain, as it certainly deserves, high popularity, is Mr. Routledge's 'James Montgomery's Poems.' It appears as a pendant to his well-known selections from Wordsworth and Longfellow, which have attained success in the last two years. Montgomery is a safe and level versifier, and his uniform good feeling and subdued taste is almost an excuse for the absence of the more divine qualities of the poet. Mr. Aris Willmott prefaces the collection with some observations which would be none the worse did he not use the word Catholic in a vulgar sense. The woodcuts, if deficient in originality, are executed with great mechanical skill, and as specimens of typographical excellence have never been exceeded.—In this respect they present a contrast to the beautiful edition of Tennyson's 'Princess' (Moxon), illustrated by Maclise in some admirable and most correct drawings, which, had they been as well cut and well printed as the Montgomery, would have left nothing to desire.—In Cats' 'Moral Emblems,' published by Mr. Longman, we have a production of a far more ambitious form. There is a valuable class of literature, little known and less valued among ourselves, consisting of emblematic and allegorical picture-proverbs, of which the only congeners among ourselves are the word-emblems of Quarles, and that class of poetry of which Herbert and Vaughan are the best known representatives. In Holland there was a great classical writer of this school, Jacob Cats, who had the luck to be associated with Adrian Van der Venne as his illustrator. This is the pair of emblematisers, the one pictorial, the other poetical, from whom the compilation issued in so sumptuous a form by Mr. Longman is derived. But Cats has a partner in this publication, one Robert Farlie, a Scotchman, whose forgotten work, 'Lychnocausia,' is added by Mr. Longman to Cats' 'Emblems.' As a literary curiosity

Farlie's work deserves attention. It rings every sort of change on the unpromising subject of lamps and candles; and every conceivable variety of the history of lights is invested with an odd and far-fetched moral meditation and commentary. The accompanying verses are always ingenious, sometimes very clever, and never other than suggestive: while the vignettes are at least a curious instance of ingenuity, in which the variety generally atones for the artistic mediocrity. Van der Venne's old engravings, stiff, solid, and grave, are very admirably rendered by Mr. Leighton: and we note the appearance of the book as likely to tell very favourably on art. There is a tendency to flimsiness and prettiness in most of our illustrations, which these grave, conscientious drawings will, if fairly studied, modify; and as illustrations of seventeenth century manners and costume, they possess an historical value. Every bit of property—to use the stage language—and every accessory contains something of allusion, and the satire is never ill-tempered. We must pass the highest eulogium on the mechanical and typographical execution of the book, and in dignity and artistic aim the volume is far ahead of its compeers. On the literary portion of the work, contributed by Mr. Richard Pigot, we cannot pass an unqualified eulogium. He has translated *Cats*, and with considerable skill: but the form of the book necessitated a blank page. *Cats'* emblem and Van der Venne's illustration occupy two pages: Farlie's little poem one: and the whole book is symmetrically divided into quatrains of pages. This arrangement necessitated a blank page, which Mr. Pigot has thought proper to fill with an omnium-gatherum of what he considers to be illustrative proverbs, adages, and choice bits of moral scraps from every conceivable authority. They show that Mr. Pigot has been a very multifarious reader; but they do not prove that he is an accurate transcriber, or a scholar: and, in our judgment, the necessity of filling a page was often the final cause of his selections. Theognis, Wilbye's Madrigals, the Four Gospels, and L. E. L. are hardly authorities that we like to see in juxtaposition, even for the most moral of sentiments. There is a great parade of literature which we think may, upon examination, be found delusive. For ourselves, we do not pretend to be judges of the appropriateness of certain Turkish proverbs cited by the editor; but we do know that the quotations in the following pages betray an ignorance of Latin:—pp. 7, 15, 19, 47, 50, 55, 83, 98, 167. But the author with whom Mr. Pigot is most unlucky is *Syrach*. With entire ignorance that this writer is the author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, we have the following quotation:—

‘ — summisque negatum

Stare diu, nimioque graves sub pondere lapsus.’

*Syrach*. iii. 12,—

which, if from anything, is from some metrical paraphrase of the apocryphal writer which Mr. Pigot has fallen across, as he has met with an old French translation of Ecclesiasticus, which, utterly ignorant of its source, leads him into the following unlucky duet of quotations:—p. 147, ‘Ne monstre pas ta vaillance à bien boire,’ &c.—*Syrach*. xxxi. 29 [*i.e.* 25]; and then he quotes, ‘Wine measurably drank [*i.e.* drunk] and in season

[i.e. in reason] bringeth,' &c.—*Ecclesiasticus* xxi. 28, 30. Mr. Pigot will be very much surprised to know that his Latin poet, and the French moralist, and *Ecclesiasticus*, and *Syrach*, are all one and the same author. We must, however, add that Mr. Pigot's translations are lively; and that his drawbacks are confined to claims to a scholarship which his acquirements cannot support: and we regret that there is this abatement to a volume which in other respects does great credit to all concerned in its production.

One of the most pleasant books of the day is Dr. Wordsworth's new edition of Park's 'Life of Mr. Stevens, sometime Treasurer to Queen Anne's Bounty' (Rivingtons). Mr. Stevens continued and represented the old-fashioned and solid Churchmanship of that school of which the Nonjurors and Robert Nelson are the most distinguished examples. This book shows what an amount of real work was done by those who inherited the high principles of Horne, Jones of Nayland, and their contemporaries; and such men not only relieve a century from much of the stigma which has been cast upon it, but this instance of the Christian gentleman displays an amount of quiet personal sacrifice and a life full of zeal and charity, which in other ages would have received a more enduring recognition than this modest memoir. Dr. Wordsworth's notes, and his catalogue of the members of 'Nobody's Club' especially, are not the least recommendation of a book which deserves a permanent place in our religious biography.

Mr. Todd, formerly of Manchester, has preached and printed a good harvest-home sermon, under the title of 'The Feast' (Masters), in which he disposes effectively of some objections raised against it by a local 'Teetotal Association.'

'Aggesden Vicarage' (J. W. Parker) is by far the best of the many tales to which Miss Yonge's success has given rise. In subtle and delicate analysis of character, and in real life-painting, we are not sure that the present authoress—for the lady's hand is apparent in it—does not equal the writer of the 'Heir of Radclyffe.' Plot, incident, and scenery are scarcely attempted in 'Aggesden Vicarage.' The book is a sort of *tour de force*: the materials selected being of the scantiest and homeliest, the problem is to display and to apply moral principles as they ought to be found working in the simplest of households and in the trivial concerns of common life. The lesson is that nothing is too mean or small not to be done on right motives. That this conventional life may not occasionally tend to a morbid extreme, just as people who are always coddling are apt to catch cold, is undeniable: but the whole subject is a very deep and important one; and of the thoughtful way in which it is treated in this work there cannot be two opinions.

It is not to be wondered at, though the spirit is alien from that revelational aspect of God's dealings with mankind which views Him as working evermore in His Church, that the present political aspect of the Continent has given encouragement to the theological *ambubaiarum collegia*, phar-

*macopole*. The notorious Dr. Cumming has got himself puffed, or has got leave to puff himself, in the *Times*, to the no small loss of literary credit of the great newspaper. Among a host of imitators seldom worse than himself, we may mention the 'Revival Movement,' by Major Bolton (Houlston and Wright), who tells us that the Papacy is to be finally destroyed in December, 1859; that next year the Turks are to be driven out of Palestine by the Czar, but in 1868 the Russians are all to be destroyed upon the mountains of Israel, after which Babylon is to be destroyed; which Babylon, with a liberalness which argues an approach to common sense, but which has suggested the absurdity of this school of prophecy, we are told is 'the countries formerly constituting the Babylonian empire' (p. 40); after all this is to ensue a 'Millennial Revival.'

Mr. Heilbroun has done service in compiling, from Bishop Mant's Bampton Lectures, an antidote to the Irish fanaticism, 'A Short Tract for Revivalists' (Rivingtons), which would do good, were there the least hope that this matter can be dealt with by reason. We hope to take up the whole subject; and it will be best discussed when, as will be the case three months hence, much of the delusion will have passed away. If a decisive test were wanted of the general character of the movement, such could be found in the very mechanical and business-like way in which it is attempted, hitherto with very little success, to 'get up' revivals in England. A clear and brief argument on the whole subject is contained in an anonymous pamphlet, 'The Second Coming of Christ.' (Edinburgh: Lendrum. London: Masters.) When we use the phrase 'get up,' we are aware that it is an invidious one: but the following extract from a Liverpool newspaper will explain our meaning. The speaker is the Rev. Dr. McNeile; the occasion the Prize-Day at the Collegiate Institution, the Bishop of the Diocese presiding:—

'He hoped they would bear with him, when, for the edification of the children, he read a passage met with a day or two ago, from an address made by a Clergyman in the diocese of Hereford, to a large meeting at Newport, in Monmouthshire. He told what he saw in a school at the North of Ireland, during a visit there, in a town with which he (Dr. McNeile) was well acquainted. He said in the school the children were so serious, so quiet, looking up with so much intelligence when they were addressed, that he remarked to his companion, the Clergyman of the place, "What extraordinary children these are." "Yes," the answer was, "ever since the revival of religion they are quite different children." On a Saturday evening, as the Clergyman was passing a church, he saw a door open and he looked in. Inside there was an inner door, and while he was in the passage he heard from within the voice of boys in prayer. He paused and listened, and heard words like these:—"Oh, God, have mercy on these dear boys, who are so sorry for their sins. Oh, God, convert these boys, so unhappy; put down thy hand, oh God, and lift them up, and show them what Jesus has done for them." He opened the door, and there were six boys inside—three kneeling and three standing; the three who were standing were praying. He said, "My dear boys, what is the matter?" "Oh, sir," said one of them, "these three boys that are kneeling are so anxious about their souls, and we are



'praying for them.' He said, very seriously, "Have you found comfort yourselves, my dear boys?" "Yes, sir, we have been very anxious indeed about our own souls; but we have found peace through Jesus Christ." Those boys had been engaged in that way an hour and a half on a summer evening. The rev. gentleman (Dr. McNeile) referred to a private book which he had seen, kept by a boy now at Harrow School, in which were entries, "Oh, Lord, help me in writing my Latin verses;" "Oh, Lord, help me to remember the tenses of the Greek verbs;" "Oh, Lord, help me to keep my temper;" "*Oh, Lord, help me to play at cricket*" (a laugh). No, no, dear boys, do not laugh; oh, this was one of the most perfect specimens of real prayer that ever came under his notice. The rev. doctor proceeded to hold these instances up as worthy examples, and concluded by warmly seconding the motion.'

Mr. Neale's 'Translation of the Liturgies of S. Mark, S. James, S. Clement, S. Chrysostom, and the Church of Malabar,' (Hayes), worthily completes the good work which that accomplished ritualist began in his late edition of the Greek originals of these primitive sources of pure eucharistical doctrine. It was a great thing to have given to the Church, in so complete and accessible a form, a critical text of these sacred monuments of the primitive faith, which were before quite unattainable, except at a serious expense, by the theological student. But it is almost a greater advantage to be able to point to the present scholarly translation, in which an ordinary layman will be able to find all that he needs to know of the venerable ritual with which the Sacrament of the Eucharist has been celebrated in the principal Churches of the East from apostolic times. To an honest and reflective mind the perusal of this little volume will be worth more than many a formal essay on eucharistical doctrine; and it has a special value as a help to devotion, which could not be shared by a merely scientific treatise. We hope to hear that the original text of these Liturgies has been made a subject for our theological or ordination examinations. Merely in a philological sense, the study of their language is very important, in its relation to the Hellenistic Greek of the New Testament. But we should be still more glad to hear that, as a consequence of, and in some sense a compensation for, the painful controversies about the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist which have well-nigh distracted the Scotch Church, many of our more educated communicants had begun to inquire for themselves, by the aid of the present translation, in what words and forms the founders of the Eastern Churches embodied their faith as to this sacrament. Of the Translations before us, some are altered from Mr. Neale's own 'Introduction to the History of the Holy Eastern Church;' that of S. Clement is corrected from Brett, and that of the Malabar Liturgy is entirely new. They are all very readable, and, so far as our examination has extended, very literal and exact. There are numerous explanatory notes, but we are glad to see that the Editor, except in one instance in the preface, has scrupulously abstained from anything of a polemical character. In addition to the text, there is a succinct introduction, which explains the families into which ritualists have divided the ancient Liturgies, points out the chief differences

between the Eastern and the Western groups ; gives an abstract of the component parts of a fully developed Liturgy ; explains the peculiar ritual arrangements of an Oriental Church ; and, finally, affords a key to the mystical meaning of the more remarkable Eastern ceremonies. In the Appendix there is a most curious collection of the Formulæ of Institution as they occur in every extant Liturgy, sixty-seven in number, including, of course, those of the Monophysite, Nestorian, and Syro-Jacobite bodies. We have only to complain of the inferiority of the type and paper employed, and the small size of the page. But these blemishes are due to the cheap form in which the work appears. Still, for a book of permanent value, and one which ought to have its place in every clergyman's library, the octavo form is in all respects preferable. It is our earnest hope that this most able and useful work may assume this greater dignity in a second edition.

Mr. Benjamin Webb, Vicar of Sheen, has contributed to a local attempt at a county history—'The Annals of the Diocese of Lichfield'—'A History of Sheen.' It is quite curious to see how much of interesting information on an unpromising subject, a rude yet picturesque village in the wild Peak country, a diligent and earnest searcher may discover. Had the Clergy been for the last two or three centuries aware of the value to history of their local memoranda, taken on the spot and authenticated by documents daily disappearing, our large county histories would have been unnecessary. It ought to be a point of parochial duty for every incumbent to acquire what facts he can about the topographical and monumental history of his parish. Mr. Webb has furnished a very favourable specimen of such a parochial monograph ; and if the humblest it is not the least useful of his many services to literature.

Of an extremely useful and important work, 'Wiltch's Geography and Statistics of the Church,' the first volume has appeared, translated by Mr. Leitch (Bosworth), formerly known as the translator of Ottfried Müller's Mythology. It is announced and advertised with a 'Preface by Mr. F. Denison Maurice,' &c. ; said Preface consists of two pages, of which the upshot is that Mr. Maurice knows nothing, or next to nothing, about the translation which he prefaces, but has no doubt that it is a good book. Had Mr. Leitch reduced his learned author into a tabular form, he had, in our judgment, produced a more useful book.

## NOTICE.

[We are desirous to receive from Colonial Church authorities, and Colonial Booksellers, offers for establishing an Agency, on terms suitable to the Colonial Clergy, for the circulation of the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER. Address to the Publishers, 6, Paternoster Row.]